

TRINITY COLLEGE LIBRARY



3 1761 02858239 3



FROM THE LIBRARY OF
TRINITY COLLEGE
TORONTO

*The Gift of
The Friends of the Library*

26 387

C. L. Jeakins

Oct 1901

HAND-BOOK
OF
THE LITURGY
OF THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

BY
R. P. BLAKENEY, D.D., LL.D.,

Rector of Bridlington; Rural Dean; Canon of York.

London:
PROTESTANT REFORMATION SOCIETY,
20, BERNERS STREET, OXFORD STREET, W.

Price 1s 6d.

LONDON :
G. NORMAN AND SON, PRINTERS, HART STREET,
COVENT GARDEN.

134393

MAR 4 1991

CONTENTS.

		PAGE
CHAPTER	I.—The Primitive Churches in Britain	1-6
CHAPTER	II.—The Royal Supremacy	6-13
CHAPTER	III.—Papal Corruptions	13-21
CHAPTER	IV.—Service Books in Use before the Reformation	21-24
CHAPTER	V.—The Revision of 1549	24-27
CHAPTER	VI.—The Revision of 1552	27-30
CHAPTER	VII.—The Revisions of 1559 and 1604	30-34
CHAPTER	VIII.—The Revision of 1662	34-37
CHAPTER	IX.—The Acts of Uniformity, the Preface, and Notices	37-40
CHAPTER	X. SECTION I.—The Calendar and Lessons	40-44
	SECTION II.—The Lessons	44-48
CHAPTER	XI.—Festivals and Fasts	48-62
CHAPTER	XII. SECTION I.—Ornaments of the Church	63-68
	SECTION II.—Ornaments of the Minister	68-80
	SUPPLEMENT.—The Gown in the Pulpit	80-82
CHAPTER	XIII.—Morning and Evening Prayer	82-101
CHAPTER	XIV. SECTION I.—The Litany and Collects	101-105
	SECTION II.—The Collects with Dates	105-109
CHAPTER	XV. SECTION I.—The Communion Service	109-133
	SECTION II.—The Declaration on Kneeling	133-139
	SECTION III.—The Lord's Supper, its Nature	139-144
	SECTION IV.—Non-Communicant Attendance	144-152
	SUPPLEMENT.—The Ancient Liturgies	152-158

	PAGE
CHAPTER XVI. SECTION I.—The Baptismal Service	158-163
SECTION II.—Private Baptism	163-164
SECTION III.—Adult Baptism	164-165
SECTION IV.—The Catechism	165-167
SECTION V.—Confirmation	167-169
SECTION VI.—Baptism and its Effects .	169-179
CHAPTER XVII.—The Marriage Service	179-181
CHAPTER XVIII. SECTION I.—The Visitation of the Sick	181-186
SECTION II.—Communion of the Sick	186-187
SECTION III.—Absolution and Scripture	187-198
CHAPTER XIX. SECTION I.—Burial Service	198-199
SECTION II.—Prayer for the Dead	199-206
CHAPTER XX. SECTION I.—Churching of Women	206-207
SECTION II.—The Commination Service	207-208
SECTION III.—Prayers at Sea	208
CHAPTER XXI. SECTION I.—The Ordinal	208-212
SECTION II.—The Ministry	212-217
CHAPTER XXII.—The State Services	217-218
SOME QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS	219

INTRODUCTION.

THERE is considerable misconception as to the principles which guided our Reformers in the compilation* of our Liturgy. It has been boldly asserted by Archdeacon Freeman that, “they expected the people and Church “of the day to accept the Services as essentially, and for “all practical purposes, the same Services, revised” (as the mediæval offices); “and, what is more, as such the “Church and people manifestly did accept them. So “clear were the Revisers on this point, that Cranmer “(as Jeremy Taylor has recorded) offered to prove “that ‘the order of the Church of England, set out “by authority by Edward the Sixth, was *the same* “*that had been used in the Church for fifteen hundred “years past*’ (the italics are his). (“Principles of “Divine Service,” p. 8.) He adds:—“Some elements “or features, doubtless, they rejected, others they “expanded. *But the exact order of such elements or “parts of the old Services as they retained, they pre-“served inviolate, both in the Daily Services and*

* Freeman censures Wheatly and others for describing our Reformers as “composers and compilers” of our services. He even censures the Preface to the Prayer Book for its use of the term “compiling” as applied to the Revision of 1549. But that the Reformers, in the construction of our services, both composed and compiled, is simply a matter of fact.

“in the Communion Service, and *that without a single exception*” (the italics are his). (*Ibid.*) Now, whether they are essentially the same is a question for determination, not by favourite theories, but by facts, and to facts in this work we appeal. In the succeeding pages the reader will find abundant evidence on the subject, and will be enabled to come to a just conclusion. He will see, for example, that the Communion Service of the Church of England is essentially different from the Sarum Office of the Mass in its order, construction, accessories, and substance.

We are sorry to observe that Archdeacon Freeman has made a serious mistake as to Cranmer’s opinion on this important point. He states that “Cranmer (as “Jeremy Taylor has recorded) offered to prove that “‘the order of the Church of England, set out by “authority by Edward the Sixth, was the same that “had been used in the Church *for fifteen hundred years past.*” We turn to the place referred to in Taylor’s works, and find that he describes Cranmer as offering to prove that, “the order of the Church of England, “set out by authority of the innocent and godly Prince “Edward VI, in his High Court of Parliament, is the “same that *was* used in the Church fifteen hundred “years past.” (Taylor’s Works, vol. vii, p. 292.) Thus, Taylor does not represent Cranmer as contending that the English Service is “the same that had been “used in the Church *for fifteen hundred years past,*” but “the same that *was* used in the Church fifteen hundred “years past,” that is, in apostolic times. We give, at p. 110, a quotation from the very document to which Taylor refers, in which Cranmer expresses his readiness to prove that the English Service “is conformable to “the order which our Saviour Christ did both observe

“and command to be observed, and which His Apostles
“and His Primitive Church used many years.”
Cranmer proceeds to *denounce the Sarum office of the Mass, restored by Queen Mary, in the strongest language.*
—See p. 110.

The *S.P.C.K.* Prayer Book conveys the same misconception in the following note:—“Archbishop Cranmer
“offered to prove that the first English Prayer Book
“was the same—*i.e.*, substantially—that had been used
“in the Church for fifteen hundred years.—*Freeman's Principles of Divine Service*, i, 9.”

We regret much that a work sent forth by the
“*Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge*” should be
the medium of circulating this serious misrepresentation of Cranmer's views on a fundamental point.

Archdeacon Freeman refers to Palmer and others, who have striven to trace portions of our formularies to Gallican, Oriental, and other sources. He describes the “correspondences” as “*accidental*,” in which, no doubt, he is correct (*see* an illustration of this, p. 102), but Freeman's statement that our Services are essentially the same as the mediæval is wrong *de facto*. Our Services are Scriptural, not mediæval. Jeremy Taylor rightly observes, “Very much of our Liturgy is the “very words of Scripture,” adding, as to the Lessons “and Canticles, that they “owe nothing to the Romish “Breviaries for their production or authority.”—*Ibid.*

The Revisers of our Services do not put forth undue claims for the Liturgy, but with great moderation ask only for “such just and favourable construction as in “*common equity* ought to be allowed to all *human* “writings, especially such as are set forth by authority, “and even to the very best translations of *Holy Scripture* itself.”

It would be impossible to construct services such as criticism could not reach; "even the very best "translations of Holy Scripture itself" are human, and need "just and favourable construction." Let us be thankful that God has given to us a liturgy so devotional and scriptural.

SYNOPSIS.

CHAPTER I.—THE PRIMITIVE CHURCHES IN BRITAIN.—There is reason to believe that St. Paul preached in Britain, 1. The British Church sent representatives to Councils, 2. Augustine, the monk, missionary to the Saxons, was not received by the British Church, 2. The evangelization of the Saxons was mainly due to missionaries from Ireland, 3. The Saxon Church founded by them lost its independence in the 7th century, 5. The missionaries at Iona maintained their independence for some time after, 5. The British Church long held its ground, 5.

CHAPTER II.—THE ROYAL SUPREMACY.—Kings exercised authority in religious matters in the Jewish dispensation, 6. Constantine heard appeals on occasions of discussion in the Church, 7. So did his successors and Charlemagne, 7. The Royal Supremacy was exercised in the Anglo-Saxon Church, 8. The Norman kings resisted Papal pretensions, 10. The Royal Supremacy was completely vindicated in the reign of Henry VIII, 10. Queen Elizabeth was empowered by the Act 1 to appoint commissioners to correct “errors, heresies, schisms,” 11. The Court of Delegates, established by the 25th of Henry VIII, was restored by Act 1 Elizabeth, 11. The Court of Delegates continued till 1833, 11. The Crown is the Supreme Ordinary, the Court is the adviser of the Crown, 12.

CHAPTER III.—PAPAL CORRUPTION.—THE PAPAL SUPREMACY is a novelty, 13. **WORSHIP OF THE VIRGIN MARY.** Bonaventure, in the 13th century, published a psalter in her honour, 15. **THE WORSHIP OF IMAGES,** 16. **TRANSUBSTANTIATION.** Paschasius Radbert taught the doctrine of the corporal presence in the 9th century, 16.

The Councils of Florence and Trent defined it, 17. The doctrine of the MASS was defined by the Council of Trent, 17. PURGATORY led to the sale of indulgences, 17. IGNORANCE OF SCRIPTURE. The Council of Thoulouse restricted its use, 18. The ignorance of the clergy was complained of in Councils, 18. Pope Pius IV added twelve articles to the Creed in 1564, 19.

CHAPTER IV.—SERVICE BOOKS BEFORE THE REFORMATION.—MISSALS were various, 21. The BREVIARY contained the canonical hours, 22. Jewel and Pilkington refer in strong terms to the Breviary, 22. The MANUAL contained the occasional offices, 23. The HORÆ announced extraordinary indulgences, 23.

CHAPTER V.—THE REVISION OF 1549.—But little was effected in the reign of Henry VIII in the revision of the services. An important revision was accomplished in 1548-9, 26. The Prayer Book of 1549 was still unsatisfactory in many respects, 26. The revision of 1552 advanced onward, 27.

CHAPTER VI.—THE REVISION OF 1552.—Cranmer proceeded with caution, 28. He and Ridley took the chief part in progress, 29. Changes were effected by omission and addition, 29.

CHAPTER VII.—THE REVISIONS OF 1559 AND 1604.—The Prayer Book of 1552 was adopted in 1559 with some alterations, 30. The question of vestments was regulated, not by rubric, but by the Crown, according to the Act of Uniformity, 32. The Queen took “order” in pursuance of the Act, 32. The Mass vestments were destroyed by authority, 33. THE REVISION OF 1604 resulted from the Hampton Court Conference, 33; the most important issue of which was the publication of a new version of the Bible in 1611, 34.

CHAPTER VIII.—THE REVISION OF 1662.—The Savoy Conference failed, 35. Convocation revised the

Prayer Book. Some concessions were made to the Puritans, the most notable of which was the insertion of the declaration on kneeling, 36.

CHAPTER IX.—THE ACTS OF UNIFORMITY, THE PREFACES, AND NOTICES.—A proviso in the Act, designed to relieve the Puritans, was rejected by the Commons, 37. The Preface states the principles of the revision of 1662, 38. The notice concerning ceremonies has special reference to the reading of the Word of God, 38. The words “Anthems,” Legends, Responds, Commemorations, Synodals, and Invitatories explained, 38. The notice of ceremonies was composed for the book of 1549, 38.

CHAPTER X. SECTION I.—CALENDARS are of great antiquity in the Church, 40. A controversy existed in the early ages regarding the proper time for the Easter festival, 40. The Council of Nice decided the question, 41. The tables and rules provided in 1662 were set aside by Act of Parliament 24th Geo. II, 41. The Act provided that the year should commence on the 1st of January, 42. It provided also a new Calendar, 43.

SECTION II.—THE LESSONS.—The Reformers introduced the consecutive reading of Scripture, 45. A new Lectionary was appointed in 1871, which recognized the same principle, but made improvements, 46.

CHAPTER XI.—FESTIVALS AND FASTS.—The Table of all the feasts that are to be observed includes only Scriptural events, and saints, 48. Black Letter Days not marked for observance; important monition proving this, 49. The Church of England does not presume to canonize, 51. Various festivals explained, 51-57. Vigils were instituted on account of persecution, 58. The Church of England makes no distinction of meats as to fasting, 60. The primitive Christians did not impose fasting by *command*, 61. The Church of Rome makes a distinction of meats, and *commands* to fast, 62.

CHAPTER XII. SECTION I.—ORNAMENTS OF THE CHURCH.—The cross on the Communion Table, illegal, 63. Lights on the table, illegal, 64. Embroidered linen and lace on the table in communion time, illegal, 65. Excessive decoration of churches discountenanced by the Church of England, 66.

SECTION II.—ORNAMENTS OF THE MINISTER:—

Primitive usage.—Vestments simple, 68.

Mediæval usage.—Vestments numerous, Amice, Alb, Stole, Fanon or Maniple, and Chasuble, used in the Mass; Surplice and Cope not sacrificial, 69.

Usage of 1549.—The Reformers broke down the usage by allowing the cope as an alternative for the chasuble, and by rejecting the amice, stole, and maniple, 70.

Usage of 1552.—The Reformers retained only the surplice as the vestment of the Priest, 71.

Usage of 1559.—The Prayer Book of 1552 was adopted, but a proviso in the Act of Uniformity retained the vestments of 1549, giving power to the Queen to take “*other order*,” which she did by the Advertisements of 1565-6, which appointed the Surplice as the vestment of the celebrant, but allowed the Cope in cathedral and collegiate churches, 71-72. The Advertisements were published as “ordained by the Queen’s Majesty,” *see* document, 74. The Advertisements were recognized as a due ordering by the Queen, 76.

Usage of 1662.—Convocation adopted the note of reference to the Act, or rubric, as it is called, of 1559, but altered it materially by the introduction of the word “*retained*,” which shows that such vestments are to be worn as had been in use, 77. But the *Amice, Alb, Stole, Maniple*, and *Chasuble* had been put aside by authority and destroyed, 78. The usage of the Church has been continuous and uniform, 79.

SUPPLEMENT.—THE GOWN was lawful in the pulpit before the Reformation, and the Reformers made no special order on the subject, 80. It was worn by the

Preacher in Convocation, A.D. 1562, 81. It was required by Convocation in 1571, 81. It has been recognized by Bishops from time immemorial, even by Archbishop Laud, 81. The Puritans objected to the gown and wore a cloak, 81.

CHAPTER XIII.—MORNING AND EVENING PRAYER.—
Opening sentences classified, 82. The opening address, composed by the Reformers, explains the purposes for which we meet, 82. The General Confession, composed by the Reformers, acknowledges the corruption of human nature, 82. The Absolution composed by our Reformers is a declaration that God pardoneth sin, 82. The mediæval service commenced with the *Pater Noster*, 83. The *Amen* is to be repeated by the congregation wherever it occurs, 83. The versicles are incentives to devotion, 84. The doxology is sometimes called the *lesser*, to distinguish it from the *Gloria in excelsis*, 84. The 95th *Psalm* was called the invitational, 84. The Psalms are to be read continuously, 85. Jewel replied to Harding's objection as to the Psalms, 85. The alternate use justified, 85. The Hymns or Canticles are derived from Scripture, with the exception of the *Te Deum* and *Benedicite*, 86-87. "The Apostles' Creed" is so called because it contains the doctrines of the Apostles, 88. The early creeds did not contain the article as to the descent into hell. The soul of Christ entered into Paradise (Luke xxiii. 43), 89. The Church of England gives no definition of the word Hell occurring in the Creed, 89. The original *Hades* (ἀδης) means the invisible world, 89. Christ's soul went into the world of spirits. He thus submitted to all the conditions of death, 90. The word "Catholic" not in the earliest creeds. Still, its use is proper, 90. The words "Communion of Saints" were added as an appellative of the Church, 90. The Athanasian Creed contains the doctrines for which Athanasius contended, 90. The Southern Convocation in 1879 adopted a declaration as to its meaning, 91. The

greater part of the Nicene Creed was put forth by the Council of Nice, A.D. 325, 91. The words, "And from the Son" (*filioque*), added in the 6th century, were gradually received in the West, but rejected by the Eastern Church, 92.

TURNING TO THE EAST in the Creed is not sanctioned by any rubric, or canon, 92. The "lesser Litany" consists of three short petitions, 93. The *versicles* which follow are taken from the Psalms, 93. Of the Collects and Prayers which follow, some are derived from ancient Liturgies, others were composed by the Reformers, 93-95. An Act of Parliament was passed in 1872 to provide for shortened services, 95-97.

CHAPTER XIV. SECTION I.—THE LITANY, as Comber remarks, has "a resemblance to many ancient litanies, but is not the same with any one." Cranmer recast the service rejecting the invocations of saints, and introduced new subjects of prayer, 101. The Litany has been divided variously by Liturgiologists, 103. The form of the Litany, in its short petitions, has many advantages, 104. The English Reformers abolished Litany processions, 105. They retained the perambulation of parishes to fix boundaries, but required the Litany to be said in church, 105.

SECTION II.—COLLECTS with their dates.—The collects are derived from ages anterior to Romanism, or were composed by our Reformers and Reviewers, 106. Epistles and Gospels are of ancient use in the Church, 109.

CHAPTER XV. SECTION I.—THE COMMUNION SERVICE, AUTHORSHIP, AND SOURCES.—Our English Communion office is not a translation of the Sarum Mass, but differs from it in its principles, language and structure, 109. Cranmer protested against the Mass in the reign of Mary, 110. The title, "The Lord's Supper," is derived from 1 Cor. xi. 20, 112. Our Reformers rejected the word Mass, 112. Jewel

explains the origin of the word, 112. The first three rubrics relate to discipline, 113. The word Altar was expunged by our Reformers, 113. The first and second and third rubrics relate to the exclusion of the unworthy; the minister has not absolute power, 113. The Ten Commandments and responses were introduced by our Reformers, 114. The prayers for the monarch were composed in 1549. The notice regarding holy days was intended to exclude Romish days, 114. The rubric, as it is in the Sealed Books, requires the banns of marriage to be read after the Nicene Creed, 115. The word offertory points to the money offerings, 115. The word oblations cannot refer to the bread and wine: 1. The rubric directs that when there are no alms or oblations, the words "alms and oblations" shall be unsaid, 117; 2. The proposal, in the revision of 1662, to "offer up" the alms, was rejected, 117. The exhortations were composed by our Reformers, 118. The absolution was partly composed by our Reformers, 118. The comfortable words were introduced in 1548, 118. The *Sursum Corda*, "lift up your hearts," and three of the Prefaces are derived from the early Church, 118. The other Prefaces were composed by the Reformers, 118. The prayer of humble access was composed in 1548, 119. The rubric requiring the Celebrant to break the bread "before the people" is inconsistent with the eastward position, 119. That position is not in accordance with the immemorial usage of the Church, 120. It is Romish, and not primitive, 121. The prayer of consecration was composed in 1549, and recast in 1552, 121. The Romish and English prayers of consecration contrasted, 121-128. The rubrics which follow in their usages differ from the Roman, 131. The two thanksgiving prayers were composed by the Reformers, 129. The first is a prayer in which we present the oblation of ourselves, 130. The *Gloria in excelsis* is traceable to the 4th century, 130. The benediction was composed by our Reformers, 130. Three of the six collects were composed by the Re-

formers, 130. Of the nine concluding rubrics, some are directed against private Mass, the use of wafer bread, and the reservation of the elements, 131.

SECTION II.—THE DECLARATION on kneeling.—This was added to the Prayer Book by order of Council 27th October, 1552, 133. It was designed to allay the scruples of those who objected to kneeling, 133. Gardiner and the Romanists held that Christ Himself was present under the forms of bread and wine, in a supernatural, not gross manner, 134. The Reformers contended against this subtle doctrine, and not merely against an exaggeration, 135. The declaration rejects corporal presence, or the presence of the body of Christ in the elements, and therefore adoration, on the ground that Christ's natural body is in Heaven "*not here*," 137. The change of the words "real and essential there being" to "corporal," in 1662, does not affect the point at issue, the expressions being equivalent, 137. If the Church held that Christ Himself is in the elements supernaturally and spiritually, she would not have forbidden, but enjoined adoration, 139.

SECTION III.—THE LORD'S SUPPER: ITS NATURE.—The nature of the Lord's Supper appears from (1) the occasion, namely, the passover, a feast of commemoration; (2) the circumstances, there being no altar in the chamber; (3) the words of institution, which could not be understood absolutely—(a) for His body was not then given, (b) Jesus said "do this in remembrance of me," (c) the cup was not literally the New Testament; (4) the law, as sanctioned by the Apostles, forbade the use of blood, 139-143. The doctrine that the living and glorified Saviour is received in the elements is irreconcilable with Scripture, 143. The Mass is opposed to Scripture, 143; even Leonardo da Vinci's picture is at variance with the Mass, 151.

SECTION IV.—NON-COMMUNICANT attendance was not encouraged by the book of 1549, 144. It was denounced in the book of 1552-1559 and 1604, 144-145. Attendance,

without reception, is at variance with the service, which supposes that all who are present partake, 145. Goulburn refers to the evil of the practice, 146. Maskell states that with one exception none but communicants were allowed to be present, in the primitive Church, at communion, 146. The Agape, 146. The mixed cup, 151. Ancient Liturgies, 152.

CHAPTER XVI. SECTION I.—THE BAPTISMAL SERVICES AND CATECHISM.—Bucer compiled a service for the administration of baptism, 158. The reformers had this service before them in the preparation of the English office, 158. The book of 1549 had retained objectionable practices which were rejected in 1552, 159. Many portions of the service were composed by the reformers, 160-161.

SECTION II.—THE MINISTRATION OF PRIVATE BAPTISM.—The words “lawful minister” were inserted in the office of private baptism in 1604. This was modified in 1661, 163.

SECTION III.—THE SERVICE FOR THE BAPTISM OF ADULTS was composed in 1661, 163.

SECTION IV.—THE CATECHISM.—The first part of the catechism was composed in 1549, 164. The sacramental portion was added in 1604, 165. Bishop Overall “penned” but did not compose this latter portion, 166. The words “generally necessary” are different in meaning from universally necessary, 166. That the faithful receive the body and blood of Christ is inconsistent with corporal presence, 166.

SECTION V.—CONFIRMATION.—The reformed ideal of confirmation is different from the mediæval, 167. The statement as to forgiveness of sin is conditional, 168.

SECTION VI.—BAPTISM AND ITS EFFECTS.—The word regeneration occurs twice in the Bible, 169. But there are cognate expressions, 169. The word regeneration denotes (1) change of state, and (2) also moral renovation, 169. In the former sense the Israelites are

called the children of God, as the circumcised and covenant people, 170. But the Old Testament also recognizes the circumcision of the heart, 170. The same distinction applies to the Christian Church whose members are called "Saints," or holy, 172. The children of a Christian parent are described as "holy," 172. This distinction was recognized by Baxter, 172. Many are partakers of gifts of the Holy Ghost (1 Cor. xiii. 1), who are not renewed in heart, 174. Thus the child by baptism is admitted into a new condition of privilege, and prayer is offered that it may receive the "fulness of grace," 174. The articles of religion reject the doctrine of *opus operatum*, which was defined by the Council of Trent, 175. The subject was discussed by the reformers, 175. The possession of the higher blessings in baptism is conditional, 176. (1) The Article on the Sacraments was framed in opposition to the Tridentine doctrine. (2) The Baptismal service is derived mainly from the Cologne office which was prepared by Bucer; (3) Our service was approved by Peter Martyr, 177-178.

CHAPTER XVII.—THE MARRIAGE SERVICE.—The Reformers composed many portions of the Marriage Service, 179-180. They rejected numerous superstitions, 179-180. The reception of the Holy Communion by the bride and bridegroom is optional, not compulsory as it was before the revision of 1662, 181.

CHAPTER XVIII. SECTION I.—THE VISITATION OF THE SICK.—Several parts of the service were composed by the Reformers; others were recast, 181-182. Some important differences between the Anglican and Roman forms of absolution, 184. Auricular Confession not recognized by the service, 184. The indicative form of absolution designed for the remission of Church censures, 185.

SECTION II.—COMMUNION OF THE SICK.—A rubric in the Communion of the sick teaches that the patient

“may eat and drink the body and blood of Christ,” although he do not receive the sacrament with his mouth, 186. Faith feeds, 186.

SECTION III.—ABSOLUTION AND SCRIPTURE.—Matt. xviii. 18, and John xx. 23, while relating to all Ministers, have a special reference to the Apostles who possessed extraordinary gifts and powers, 187. Dr. Newman admits this, 188. The Roman theory that the Divine forgiveness is conveyed by a special absolving form is unscriptural, 188-189. The Apostles remitted sins by the preaching of the Word, 190. Three forms of absolution, 192. The indicative form of absolution was introduced for the remission of censures, 194. The Church of Scotland excommunicates and absolves, 196. The use of the Service for the Visitation of the Sick is not imperative, 196. The Church of England in the Homilies preaches against Auricular Confession, 197.

CHAPTER XIX. SECTION I.—BURIAL SERVICE.—The Prayer Book of 1549 retained prayers for the dead; the Prayer Book of 1552 rejected them, 199.

SECTION II.—PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD REJECTED.—The Church of England rejects prayers for the dead, 199. Cosin refers to Bucer’s suggestion, 200. Wheatly refers to Bucer’s suggestion, 200. Important changes were made in 1552, 201. The Church of England teaches that the righteous departing enter immediately into bliss, 203. The Reformers rejected prayers for the dead, 205.

CHAPTER XX. SECTION I.—OTHER OFFICES.—CHURCHING OF WOMEN.—In 1552 the title of the service was changed to disconnect it from the Jewish purification, 206. Some other important changes were made in 1552, 206. The service is one of thanksgiving.

SECTION II.—THE COMMINATION SERVICE underwent important changes in the revisions of 1552 and 1662. 207.

SECTION III.—THE FORMS OF PRAYER TO BE USED AT SEA were prepared in the revision of 1662, 208. Its committal of the dead is a comment upon the committal in the Burial Service, 208.

CHAPTER XXI. SECTION I.—THE ORDINAL was published in 1550, 208. The questions and answers and other portions were composed by the Reformers, 209. The words in the Ordination of Priests, “Receive the Holy Ghost,” is a prayer, 211. The pastoral staff, with vestment and cope, were laid aside in 1552 in the Consecration of Bishops, 212.

SECTION II.—THE MINISTRY.—The Bishop of Durham (Dr. Lightfoot) explains the relation of the Episcopate to the Presbyterate, 212. Eminent Romish theologians hold that the Episcopate is an extension of the Presbyterian order, 213. The Church of England recognizes the validity of the orders of the Church of Scotland, 215. The word Priest signifies a Presbyter, not a Sacrificer, 215.

CHAPTER XXII. THE STATE SERVICES.—The form of Thanksgiving for the 20th of June when “Her Majesty began her happy reign” is obligatory, and most appropriate, 217. The other State services are not now in force, 219.

HAND-BOOK OF THE LITURGY.

CHAPTER I.

THE PRIMITIVE CHURCHES IN BRITAIN.

Earliest Mission to Britain.—There is some reason to believe that the Apostle Paul preached the Gospel in Britain.

Clement, who wrote about A.D. 97, says that Paul “having come to *the boundary of the west*, gained the illustrious fame of martyrdom under our rulers.”—*Epistle to the Corinthians*, chap. v.

Theodoret, who wrote in the 5th century, expressly enumerates “*the Britons*” amongst those whom the Apostles “persuaded to adopt the laws of the Crucified.”—*Sermon IX, De Leg.*, Tome iv.

Eusebius, who wrote in the 4th century, regarded it as a Divine work that the Apostles “passed over the ocean to those called the *British isles*.”—*Dem. Evang.*, Lib. iii, c. 7.

Tertullian, who lived in the 2nd century, described Britain as subject to Christ.—*Adv. Judæos*, c. 7.

The Diocletian persecution, A.D. 303, extended to Britain, at which time Alban received the crown of martyrdom.

Representatives from the British Church attended the Councils of Sardica, A.D. 347, and Ariminum, A.D. 359.

The British Church, thus founded at an early date, was not subject to any foreign jurisdiction.

The Romish Mission.—Augustine arrived in Britain,

A.D. 596, on his mission to the *Saxons*. He sought the co-operation of the British, but they declined, refusing to observe the Romish customs regarding the time of keeping Easter, and other matters. Bede, called the Venerable, who wrote his history in the 8th century, and who was in communion with Rome, states that “after long disputation, they did not comply with either the entreaties, or the exhortations, or the rebukes of Augustine and his companions, but preferred their own traditions before all the Churches in the world.”—*Eccles. Hist.*, Book ii, chap. 2.

Augustine repeated his efforts, but the Britons “refused to receive him as their Archbishop” (*ibid.*). Bede adds that Augustine “is said in a threatening manner to have foretold that in case they would not join in peace with their brethren, they should be warred upon by their enemies” (*ibid.*). He relates that subsequently to the death of Augustine, Ædilfrid, the Saxon king, “made a great slaughter of that perfidious nation.”—*Ibid.*

The stand thus made by the Britons is the more remarkable when it is remembered that the doctrines of modern Romanism, and the pretensions of the Popes, were not then developed. Bede was himself a strong partisan of the Roman Communion, a fact which gives the greater force to his testimony. The Britons long maintained their independence. Bede, under the date A.D. 731, states that the Britons “wrongfully and from wicked custom oppose the Easter of the whole Catholic Church.”—Book v, chap. 23.

The Irish Mission.—The evangelization of the Saxons, though usually attributed to Augustine and his mission, is mainly due to missionaries from Ireland.

The book of “The CHRONICLE of Florence of Worcester” contains the following important record:—“A.D. 565, Columba, priest and abbot, came from Ireland into Britain, the most potent King Bridius being King of the Picts, and converted the northern Picts to Christianity. Hence he obtained from them the island of Hii

for the purpose of building a monastery" ("Church Historians of England." Seeley, 1853). This occurred thirty years before the Mission of Augustine.

Hii, or Iona, on the coast of Argyleshire, became famous as the seat of a missionary institution which exercised great influence far and wide. Waller remarks, "There is every reason to believe that to Columba is due the honour of having been the first to give the light of the Gospel to the Anglo-Saxons."—*The Imperial Dictionary*.

Adamnan, an Abbot of Iona, A.D. 700, mentions Anglo-Saxons as among his converts.* But the Irish Church, of which Columba was a minister, was independent of all foreign jurisdiction. Bede affords abundant evidence of this. It appears, even from a letter of Laurentius, successor to Augustine in the See of Canterbury, who says that "the Scots in no way differ from the Britons in their behaviour, for Bishop Dagan coming to us not only refused to eat with us but even to take his repast in the same house where we were entertained" (Book ii, chap. 4). Bede refers to "the Scots, who inhabit the island of Ireland, which is next to Britain" (*ibid.*). Many Scots from Ireland migrated to the coasts of North Britain, from whom ultimately the name of Scotland was derived. The evangelization of the Saxons is largely due to Scots.

After the death of *Æ*Edilberct, the patron of Augustine, the mission in Kent sustained a great reverse. The accession of Eadbald, his son, to the throne, proved, as Bede remarks, "very prejudicial to the infant Church" (chap. 6). At one time Laurentius determined to follow the example of Mellitus and Justus, and to abandon the mission altogether. Events, however, took a more favourable turn; the King Eadbald renounced his idolatry, and recalled Mellitus and Justus. Bede says, "Justus returned to the city of Rochester over which he had presided, but the

* See Dr. Reeves's edition of "Adamnan." Dublin, 1857.

Londoners would not receive Mellitus, choosing rather to be under their idolatrous High Priests.”—Book ii, chap. 6.

In the year 627 *Æduini*, King of Northumberland, married the daughter of King *Ædilberct* of Kent (chap. 9). This connection brought him under the influence of Bishop Paulinus, who accompanied the Queen, and by whom he was persuaded to embrace the Gospel. But his immediate successors apostatized from the faith. On their death, Oswald succeeded to the throne, and requested the Scots, by whom he had been baptized, to send him a Bishop to instruct the nation in the faith of Christ. Bishop Aidan, of Iona, was chosen for this purpose: “A man,” says Bede, “of singular meekness, piety and moderation, zealous in the cause of God, though not altogether according to knowledge” (Book iii, chap. 3). The reasons for this qualifying remark appears from the statement which follows: “for he was wont to keep Easter according to the custom of his country.” Bede states that “the King appointed him his episcopal see in the Isle of Lindisfarne” (Book iii, chap. 3). But Bede bears high testimony to the work which he and his clergy carried on: “From that time many from the region of the Scots came daily into Britain, and with great devotion preached the word of faith to those provinces of the English over which King Oswald reigned.” Bede adds that “the people gladly flocked together to hear the word.”—Book iii, chap. 3.

Aidan was succeeded by Finan, and Finan by Colman, in the see of Lindisfarne. Florence of Worcester, in his “Chronicle,” gives a list of the Bishops, and places Aidan at the head in the above order,—Aidan, Finan, and Colman. By their instrumentality, under God, Christianity was established from the Humber to Edinburgh.

There were then three Christian communities in Briton—the British Church, independent of Rome; the Saxon Church, also independent of Rome; and the Church founded by Augustine.

Loss of Saxon Independence.—But circumstances took place in the reign of Osniu (Oswy) which gave a new turn to ecclesiastical affairs in England. The King had been brought up by the Scots, and adhered to their communion, but his wife had been educated in the communion of Augustine. Her chaplain, Romanus, was a warm zealot of the Roman See. The clashing of observances and views gave rise to controversy in the court, and the King determined to bring it to an end. A meeting was convened for the discussion and settlement of the questions in dispute. Colman, attended by his clergy, defended the old customs of the Church; while Wilfrid, tutor of Alchfrid, who was now associated with his father on the throne, espoused the Romish pretensions. Bede gives some account of the discussion, but writes with prejudice. The result was as it might be expected; the influence of Alchfrid and the Queen prevailed, and the King gave his decision accordingly. Bishop Colman and his clergy then withdrew to Ireland. Bede remarks that Colman perceiving that “his doctrine was rejected and his sect despised, took with him such as would not comply with the Catholic Easter.”—Book iii, chap. 26.

The community at Hii or Iona adhered to their distinctive principles till A.D. 716. Bede relates that Ecgbert “converted them from the inveterate tradition of their ancestors” (Book v, chap. 22). He adds, in the same passage, that the Britons “continue even yet inveterate in their errors and halt from the right path.”—*Ibid.*

British Church continues its Independence.—It appears that the Britons maintained their independence with fluctuating fortune long after. Bede testifies to their ecclesiastical independence in the 8th century (*see* p. 2). Florence of Worcester, in his “Chronicle,” states, under the date 827, that “Ecgbert, King of the West Saxons, led an army into the territory of the North Britons, and, notwithstanding their resistance, brought them under his dominion” (p. 297, *ut supra*). The subjugation of the Britons was not complete.

Under the date 1049 Florence refers to “Griffin, King of the South Britons,” who invaded the coast of England and “did considerable damage” (p. 281, *ut supra*). It was not until the reign of Edward I and death of Llewellyn, A.D. 1282, that they were finally subdued. The Papal See acquired great power in England, but its supremacy was never *completely* established.

CHAPTER II.

THE ROYAL SUPREMACY.

KINGS in the dispensations before Christ exercised their authority in religious matters.

Hooker remarks :—

“It was not thought fit in the Jews’ Commonwealth, that the exercise of supremacy ecclesiastical should be denied unto him, to whom the exercise of chiefty civil did appertain; and therefore their Kings were invested with *both*.”—*Eccles. Polity*, Book viii.

He adds :—

“By this power David, Asa, Jehoshaphat, Ezekias, Josias, and the rest, made those laws and orders which the Sacred History speaketh of, concerning matter of *mere religion, the affairs of the temple and service of God*.”—*Ibid.*

The Primitive Church.—And the same rule holds good under the Christian dispensation. Constantine, when he embraced Christianity, took part in the government of the Church. He convened the Council of Nice to heal the sad divisions then existing in the Church Catholic, and, as Eusebius states, “gave patient audience to all alike, and received every proposition with steadfast attention, and, by occasionally assisting the argument of each party in turn, he gradually

disposed even the most vehement disputants to a reconciliation.”*—*Life of Constantine*, Book iii, chap. 13.

The supremacy of the Crown was acknowledged both by orthodox and schismatic. The Donatists appealed to the Emperor from the decision of the Council of Arles (A.D. 314). Constantine investigated the case, and gave his decision (Aug. C. Cresc., iii. Quoted by the Royal Commissioners on the Courts, p. xv). The orthodox did not object to the appeal.

The Royal Commissioners on the Ecclesiastical Courts remark that “in another cognate case he (Constantine) committed the inquiry to the Pro-consul *Ælian*.”—*Ibid.*

The Commissioners further state that Augustine sought the intervention of the Emperor Honorius “to heal the division of the Church” (A.D. 411). The Emperor commissioned Marcellinus, a civilian, to preside at the meeting of the opposite parties, and “give judgment upon the question in debate. This Marcellinus did,” and “in his sentence declared that those who refused to conform should be deprived of the churches of which they had retained possession by *his permission* when they agreed to appear before him.”—*Aug.*, Tom. ix, App., p. 1175 (Ed. Gaume), quoted as above.

Similar authority was exercised by Charlemagne. The Royal Commissioners state that “when a case could not be settled before the Bishop or the Metro-

* The Greek Church in its Russian branch acknowledges the supremacy. The Holy Synod “was constituted in 1721 by Peter the Great.” It regulates all matters of doctrine and discipline. In the Edict, the Emperor pronounced as follows:—“We appoint a Spiritual College, *i.e.*, a Spiritual Synodical Administration, which is authorized to rectify, according to the regulations here following, all spiritual affairs throughout the Russian Church. . . . We constitute members of this Spiritual College, as is here specified, one President, two Vice-Presidents, four Counsellors, four Assessors.” “The number of members has been since varied. It was fixed at six in 1763, and at seven in 1818, ‘with powers to add to their number.’ The Czar is represented in the Synod by a Procurator, ‘who has a negative upon all its resolutions till laid before the Emperor.’”—See *Report of Royal Commissioners on the Ecclesiastical Courts*, p. ix.

politan, he directed that it should be brought finally before himself.”—*Capit. Francof.*, an 794.

“The Synods referred their decisions to him, that they might be supplemented, amended, and confirmed (“Concil. Arelat.”, an 813). He claimed for himself the right and the duty of following the example of Josiah in endeavouring to bring back to God the kingdom committed to him by visitation, correction, admonition, in virtue of his royal office.”—*Capit. Aquisgr.*, an 789, pref.—*Ibid.*

Supremacy in the Anglo-Saxon Church.—From the earliest days the Royal Supremacy has been recognized in Britain. It was an important factor in the Anglo-Saxon Church. This appears everywhere in Bede’s “Ecclesiastical History.” Missionaries usually addressed themselves in the first instance to Kings. Thus, Columba, from Ireland, A.D. 565, preached the Gospel to Bridius, King of the Picts, and the result is thus detailed :—

“Columba came into Britain in the ninth year of the reign over the Picts of Bridius, who was the son of Meilochon, a very powerful King, and he converted that nation to the faith of Christ by his preaching and example.”—*Bede’s Eccl. Hist.*, Book iii, chap. 4.

After this Augustine, the Monk, landed in Kent in 595, and by means of Bercta, the Queen, a Christian, obtained admission to King Ædilberct, her husband, and led him to embrace Christianity.

Kings appointed Bishops to the Sees.

There are numerous evidences of this. Thus Coinwalch, King of the West Saxons, appointed Agilberct (or Agelbert) as the Bishop of his nation. The King, after a time, divided his province into two dioceses, and brought in another Bishop, named Uini, or Wina, without consulting Bishop Agilberct, at which the latter took offence and withdrew. Bede states the facts as follows :—

“But when Coinwalch was restored to his kingdom, there came into that province out of Ireland a certain Bishop called Agilberct, by nation a Frenchman, but who had then lived a long time in Ireland for the purpose of reading the Scriptures. He joined himself to the King, and voluntarily took on himself the office of

preaching. The King, observing his erudition and industry, desired him to accept an episcopal see, and stay there as Bishop of his nation. He complied with this request, and presided as Bishop over that people many years. At length the King, who understood none but the language of the Saxons, growing weary of that Bishop's foreign tongue, privily brought into the province another Bishop of his own language, whose name was Uini, who had been ordained in France, and dividing his province into two dioceses, appointed for this last his episcopal see in the city of Venta, by the Saxons called *Uintancestir*. Agilberct, being highly offended that the King should do this without his advice, returned into France, and having received the Bishopric of the city of Paris, died there aged and full of days."—*Eccles. Hist.*, Book iii, c. 7.

In course of time the King expelled Uini, or Wina, who took refuge in Mercia, where he was appointed Bishop of the Mercians by their King.

After the discussion at Whitby, and the defeat and retirement of Bishop Colman and his clergy, Tuda was appointed to the Bishopric of Northumbria, but "held the office only for a short time." Alchfrid now sent Wilfrid to be consecrated in France, and, as Florence states, Ceadda "*was, by command of King Oswy*, consecrated Bishop of York by Wina."—*Chronicle of Florence of Worcester, in loco.*

The Royal Supremacy appears remarkably in connection with the chequered course of Wilfrid. "The Chronicle of Worcester" states that "a dissension arose between King Egfrid and the most reverend Bishop Wilfrid, and the Bishop was expelled from his see," A.D. 677. Wilfrid went to Rome, and, as Bede states, was cleared of all the charges brought against him (Book v, chap. 19). He returned to England, but, as Bede adds, "Aldfrid, King of the Northumbrians, refused to admit him" (*ibid.*). This is the more remarkable as the kingdom of Northumbria was at this time in communion with Rome.

Kings sometimes, too, exercised their authority in a wrong direction. Oswy, King of Northumbria, under the influence of his wife, who was in communion with the Roman Church, lent a willing ear to the arguments of Wilfrid in the discussion at Whitby, and decided to unite the Church in Northumbria to the community

which Augustine had established. Bishop Colman and his clergy at once withdrew.

In Saxon times, Bishops and the King sat together in assemblies, and exercised their authority alike in civil and ecclesiastical matters. There were then no separate jurisdictions. The Ealdorman and the Bishop took seats side by side in the same courts.

Norman Supremacy.—It was not until after the Norman Conquest that a separation was made. Then it was provided by the King that Bishops should hold Courts of their own, which Courts, however, derived their authority from the Crown. But the Conqueror took care to preserve his supremacy. He permitted no Papal bull or law to be published in his dominion without his approval. He would not even allow an ecclesiastical censure to be passed upon any of his officers of state without his consent. Bitter complaint has been made of this by those who take strong views of sacerdotal power.

His successors on the throne were generally not less zealous in upholding the authority of the Crown against Papal pretensions. Froude remarks :—

“While the Pope was dangerous he was dreaded and *opposed*; when age had withered his arm, the English Kings consented to withdraw their watchfulness, and his supremacy was silently allowed as an innocent superstition. It existed, as some other institutions exist at the present day, with a merely *nominal* authority; with a tacit understanding that the power which it was permitted to retain should be exerted only in conformity with the national will.”—*Hist.*, vol. i, p. 428, 2nd edit.

The Supremacy and the Reformation.—The Royal Supremacy was vindicated by the 24th Act of Henry VIII, and more completely by the 25th of the same reign. “The Court of Delegates” was created by the latter Act, and continued till 1833. This Court was constituted for each separate case by commission under the Great Seal, and, through it, the Crown exercised its authority. This Court consisted sometimes of divines and laymen; but frequently of laymen only.

The Royal Supremacy was abolished in the reign of

Queen Mary, but restored by the 1st of Elizabeth, which revived the Court of Delegates, and gave power to the Crown *to appoint Commissioners to regulate ecclesiastical questions*, A.D. 1559. This measure and the Act of Uniformity were opposed by the Bishops (Romish) then occupying the bench.

In pursuance of the Act, a Commission was issued by the Queen, 19th July, 1559, "to Parker, nominated Archbishop of Canterbury, Grindal, nominated Bishop of London, and seventeen other persons, Knights, Masters of Request, Serjeants, and Doctors of Law." The Commissioners were empowered by the Act (1 Eliz. c. 1) "to visit, reform, redress, order, correct, and amend all such errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities whatsoever, which, by any manner, spiritual or ecclesiastical power, authority, or jurisdiction, can or may lawfully be reformed, ordered, redressed, corrected, restrained, or amended to the pleasure of Almighty God, the increase of virtue, and the conservation of the peace and unity of this realm." Their powers were complete and were fully exercised. This High Court of Commission was abolished by Puritan influence in the Long Parliament.

The Court of Delegates was abolished by the Act 2 and 3 William IV, c. 92, in pursuance of the reports of a Commission consisting of the Primate (Dr. Howley), several Bishops, and others. Its authority as the adviser of the Crown was transferred to the Privy Council, A.D. 1833. By the 3rd and 4th Victoria, 1840, Archbishops and Bishops being Privy Councillors, were placed on the Committee for hearing appeals in ecclesiastical suits. In 1876 this enactment was amended, and it was provided that Bishops should sit in Court as Assessors or Advisers, not as Judges. The Court now consists of laymen assisted by the advice of Bishops. An order was drawn up November 28th, 1876, by the Queen in Council, for the attendance of at least three Bishops, one of whom must be an Archbishop: the Bishops acting in rotation.

The principle throughout these changes is the same. The Crown is the Supreme Judge; the Court, whether of Delegates or Privy Council, acting as its adviser. In each case the Court reports its opinion to the Crown, which gives the final decision. For example, in the Ridsdale Case, the Crown, in remitting the case to Lord Penzance, ruled as follows:—

“ And whereas our said Judicial Committee did on the 12th of May, 1877, report to us their opinion that the Decree or Order appealed from ought to be affirmed . . . (except in certain points). We do therefore hereby authorize and command you to resume into your own hands the said cause with all its incidents, and freely to proceed therein according to the exigence of the law and the tenour of such the recommendations of our said Judicial Committee, and to administer justice between the parties any inhibition heretofore issued to the contrary, notwithstanding.

“ Given at London under the seal which we use in this behalf this 25th day of June, in the year of our Lord 1877.

“ Signed, H. C. ROTHERY, *Registrar.*”

The Royal Supremacy thus exercised, has not only been defended by Whitgift and Hooker, but *received* and *enforced* by a long line of Bishops, including men of different schools, from the Reformation to the present day. The Church of England asserts it repeatedly in her official documents. The first Canon is entitled:—“ The King’s Supremacy over the Church of England in causes ecclesiastical to be maintained,” and provides that the Archbishops and Clergy “ shall faithfully keep and observe (and as much as in them lieth) shall cause to be observed and kept of others, all and singular laws and statutes made for restoring to the crown of this kingdom the ancient jurisdiction over the State Ecclesiastical, and abolishing of all foreign power repugnant to the same.”

The second Canon excommunicates those who affirm “ that the King’s Majesty hath not the same authority in causes ecclesiastical that the godly Kings had among the Jews and Christian Emperors of the primitive Church.”

The 37th Article is to the same effect.

The following question, with its corresponding

answer is put to the clergy in the Ordination Service:—

“ Will you then give your faithful diligence always so to minister the doctrine and sacraments, and the discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and *as this Church and Realm hath received the same*, according to the commandments of God; so that you may teach the people committed to your cure and charge with all diligence to keep and observe the same? ”

Answer.—“ I will do so by the help of the Lord.”

The question does not stop at the words “ as the Lord hath commanded,” but adds, “ *as this Church and Realm hath received the same.* ” A clergyman, therefore, so long as he remains in his position, is bound to understand the command of the Lord, not according to his private opinion, but “ *as this Church and Realm hath received the same.* ” If he change his opinion, he can withdraw his subscription.

CHAPTER III.

PAPAL CORRUPTIONS.

Papal Supremacy.—The Bishops of Rome in the early days of the Church, as the chief pastors in the capital of the Empire, naturally occupied a prominent position, but laid no claim to supremacy. The Epistles of Clement, about A.D. 97, afford evidence of this. They contain no Papal assumption of any kind. The first Epistle opens thus:—“ The Church of God which sojourns at Rome to the Church of God which sojourns at Corinth.” How different from the style assumed by the modern Bishops of Rome!

But after the removal of the seat of empire to Constantinople, the Bishop of Old Rome acquired a considerable accession of dignity and power.

The decree of the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451,

affords positive proof that as yet he only occupied a position of equality with the Bishop of Constantinople:

“Following in all things the decrees of the holy Fathers and acknowledging the canon which has just been read of the 150 Fathers, most beloved of God (the Council of Constantinople), We also decree and appoint the same thing also respecting the privileges of the Church of Constantinople, the new Rome. For the Fathers justly gave privileges to the chair of old Rome because it was the imperial city; influenced by the same consideration, the 150 Bishops much beloved of God gave *equal* privileges to the chair of new Rome, rightly judging that the city which is honoured with the empire and the Senate ought to enjoy *even in Church matters equal privileges* with Rome, the most ancient Queen.”—*Canon 28, Labbe and Cossart.*

John, the Bishop of Constantinople, however, assumed the title of Universal Bishop. Gregory, Bishop of Rome, protested as follows:—

“I confidently affirm that whosoever calls himself Universal Priest, or desires to be so called, in his pride, is the forerunner of Antichrist, because in his pride he prefers himself to the rest.”*—*Epist. 32, Ad Mauric Aug.*

It is strange, however, that the Emperor Phocas, A.D. 606, conferred the title of Universal Bishop on Boniface III.

Cardinal Baronius says that Phocas, urged by his enmity to Cyriac, Bishop of Constantinople, “declared that the Bishop of Rome was to be called the *Ecumenical*—that is, the Universal Bishop.”—*Annals*, p. 200, vol. viii.

Subsequently, the so-called “donation of Constantine,” and certain decretal epistles, truly designated “the false decretals,” contributed to the further augmentation of Papal power. In “the Donation,” Constantine is represented as describing the Bishop of Rome as Sovereign Pontiff, possessed of jurisdiction over other Bishops. In “the Epistles,” Anacletus, and other primitive Bishops, are represented as exhorting Bishops to yield implicit obedience to the

* The Benedictine editors in a note state that the word *Sacerdos* very often signifies Bishop (Epistle 49, Lib. ii). In this instance Gregory refers to the *Bishop* of Constantinople.

Popes. Cardinal Baronius, in harmony with other Romish authorities, candidly states that the epistles are “late invented evidences of no credit” (“Hist.,” p. 18, vol. xv. *Luc.* 1744). And yet the Supremacy of Rome is largely due to these forgeries of the 8th century !

The ambition of the Popes led to continual strife between them and the crowned heads. But the schisms which took place in the Papacy, time after time, together with the wickedness of certain Popes, led to a thorough examination of its pretensions, which issued in the Reformation.

Worship of the Virgin Mary. The Psalter.—Bonaventure, in the 13th century, published a Psalter in honour of the Virgin, of which the following quotation is an example :—

PSALM 2.

“Why do our enemies rage : and imagine vain things against us ?

“Let thy right hand protect us, Mother of God : as a terrible sword confounding and destroying them.

“Come unto her, all ye that labour and are heavy laden ; and she will give rest unto your souls.

“Come to her in your temptations : and the benignity of her countenance shall establish you.

“Bless her with all your heart : for the earth is full of her mercy. Glory, &c.”

The following is a parody of the *Te Deum* by the same author :—

“We praise thee, O Mother of God : we acknowledge thee, Virgin Mary.”

“All the earth doth worship thee ; the Spouse of the Everlasting Father.”

“Holy, holy, holy, Mary, Mother of God ; Mother and Virgin. The Church throughout all the world joins in calling upon thee.”

“The Mother of a Divine Majesty.”

Bonaventure is a Canonized Saint of the Church of Rome.

We have before us a modern edition of this work, published in Rome, with the *imprimatur* of the authorities in 1834.

The Worship of Images.—Cassander observes :—

“ How much the ancient Fathers in the primitive Church did abhor all manner of worshipping images, even Origen declares against Celsus.”—*Consultatio*, p. 975. Paris, 1616.

But images were gradually introduced until at length they became a striking feature in churches. The Cross was viewed with superstitious regard, and even adoration rendered to it. The *Roman Missal* on Good Friday directs the Priest to hold up the Cross and to say, *Ecce lignum crucis* (“Behold the wood of the Cross”) and the people to adore. It contains the following rubric in Latin:—“Then the clergy and laity thrice kneeling as is aforesaid (*adorant crucem*) adore the Cross.”

Transubstantiation.—The doctrine of the corporal presence was first publicly taught by Pascharius Radbert in the 9th century, and was opposed by Ratramnus, or Bertram, and other divines. The notion that Christ *Himself* is under the forms of bread and wine found acceptance in many quarters.

The following passage from “The *Chronicle of Florence of Worcester*” evinces the unscriptural character of the views of some, at least, on the subject of the Lord’s Supper. He records under the date A.D. 1099, that Pope Urban, in a Council held at Rome, denounced anathema against “all laymen giving and all persons receiving at their hands the investitures of churches.” The Pope said that “it was accursed that hands that had been exalted to so lofty an eminence as to create by their impress the all-creating God (a power granted to none of the Angels) and to offer Him for the salvation and redemption of the whole world, in the presence of the most High God the Father, should be debased to such a depth of ignominy.”—*The Church Historians of England*, p. 32. London, 1853.

It was not, however, till the Council of Florence, A.D. 1215, that the doctrine of transubstantiation was formally defined. The Council of Trent adds as follows:—

"*Canon 2.*—If any one shall say that the substance of the bread and wine remains in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist, together with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and shall deny that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, the outward forms of the bread and wine still remaining, which conversion the Catholic Church most aptly calls transubstantiation,—let him be accursed."

The Mass was the supplement of transubstantiation. It being assumed that Christ Himself is under the forms of bread and wine, it was concluded that Christ Himself is offered by the priest.

The Council of Trent formally defined the doctrine. But even the Council did not venture to affirm that Christ offered Himself as a *propitiatory* sacrifice in the *Last Supper* in the night before His death. Some of its bishops, rightly, contended that the propitiatory offering took place on the day after, when He died on the Cross. A *compromise* was effected (see chapter xv).

It is plain that the Holy Communion is now what it was at the Last Supper, and therefore not a propitiatory sacrifice. By the doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass, the Lord's Supper, which in Apostolic days was celebrated in the greatest simplicity at the feast called *Agape*, was entirely perverted.

Purgatory.—The doctrine that souls departing this life in grace but in venial sin, and needing chastisement are purged by suffering after death, gradually grew up in the Church. It reached its development in the Council of Florence. This led to gross superstition, Masses for the dead, and Indulgences. The sale of Indulgences was prohibited by the Council of Trent, but that of Masses still continues.

Indulgences.—The remission of Canonical censures, practised in the Early Ages, at length developed into the remission of the pains of purgatory by Indulgences: the sale of which, by Tetzel, was one of the immediate causes of the Reformation in Germany. The Council of Trent, seeing the result, forbade the practice. Milner, the

Romish Vicar-Apostolic, in his "End of Controversy," admits the fact that Indulgences were sold, as follows:—

"We hold that it would be a sacrilegious crime in any person whomsoever to be concerned in buying or selling them. I am far, however, Reverend Sir, from denying that Indulgences have ever been sold. Alas! what is so sacred that the avarice of man has not put up for sale! Christ Himself was sold, and that by an Apostle for thirty pieces of silver."—*Letter LIII.*

But Masses for the dead are still sold! What of the "Sacrilegious Crime," and of Judas Iscariot?

Ignorance of Scripture.—The sacred volume was practically a sealed book in the Middle Ages. Its study was discouraged. The Council of Thoulouse, A.D. 1229, decreed as follows:—

"We prohibit also the laity from possessing the Books of the Old or New Testament unless perchance some one may wish to have a psalter, or breviary for Divine offices or the hours of the Blessed Virgin. But we most strictly prohibit them from having the permitted books in the vulgar tongue."—*Labbe and Cossart Councils.*

The clergy were generally ignorant of its contents. Bishop Hooper instituted an examination of his clergy, and found that 168 of them could not repeat the Ten Commandments; thirty-one of that number being unable to state in what part of Scripture they were to be found. Thirty-one of the clergy could not tell who was the Author of the Lord's Prayer! See "Later Writings," p. 151 and note. P.S.

The ignorance and vices of the clergy were the subjects of bitter complaint at the Councils of Pisa and Constance at the beginning of the 15th century. We cite one instance from the speech of Gerson at the Council of Pisa:—

"Are they not wise in collecting wealth, in making feasts, in accumulating honours, in cherishing pomp, and are they not neglectful in governing the people, in cherishing the poor, in loving the humble, and in cutting off superfluities? Do they not rather dispute for livings by the laws of Justinian, than instruct and teach the people the law of Christ? Let them teach, I say, yea let them *learn*? For whom will you find *among the priests*, who is not *ignorant of the law of Christ*?"—*Mansi's Councils*, tome xxvi. Venice, 1784.

Certain bishops and archbishops denounced in strong terms in these Councils the gross ignorance, the horrid

crimes which prevailed everywhere. See their speeches in Archbishop "Mansi's Councils." The perusal is most painful but instructive.

All these errors, doctrinal and practical, together with the *Papal Schisms*, called loudly for reformation, the necessity of which was so generally admitted, that the Councils of Pisa and Constance were convened to carry it into effect. The Council of Trent, in its 22nd session, took up the question of Reformation, but failed to accomplish any important result. It only served to rivet the chains of superstition and error upon those who yielded to its pretensions. It empowered the Pope to formulate mediæval doctrines, and to add them to the Nicene Creed as follows:—

THE OLD CREED, A.D. 325.

B. B. ms. D

"I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible: And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of His Father before all worlds, God of God, light of light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made: Who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man, and was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate. He suffered and was buried, and the third day He rose again according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father. And He shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead: whose kingdom shall have no end.

"And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and giver of life, Who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, Who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, Who spake by the Prophets. And I believe one Catholic and Apostolic Church. I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins; and I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen."

THE NEW CREED, A.D. 1564.

"I. I most steadfastly admit and embrace Apostolic and Ecclesiastical Traditions, and all other observances and constitutions of the same Church.

"II. I also admit the Holy Scriptures, according to that sense which our Holy Mother, the Church, has held and does hold, to which it belongs, to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures; neither will I ever take and

interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

“ III. I also profess, that there are truly and properly Seven Sacraments of the new law instituted by Jesus Christ, our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not all for every one; to wit, Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony, and that they confer grace; and that of these, Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders, cannot be reiterated without sacrilege; and I also receive and admit the received and approved ceremonies of the Catholic Church, used in the solemn administration of all the aforesaid Sacraments.

“ IV. I embrace and receive all and every one of the things which have been defined and declared in the Holy Council of Trent, concerning original sin and justification.

“ V. I profess, likewise, that in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead; and that in the most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist there are truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood; which conversion the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation. I also confess, that under either kind alone, Christ is received whole and entire, and a true Sacrament.

“ VI. I constantly hold that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls detained therein are helped by the suffrages of the faithful.

“ VII. Likewise, that the Saints, reigning together with Christ, are to be honoured and invocated; and that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to be held in veneration.

“ VIII. I most firmly assert, that the images of Christ, of the Mother of God, ever Virgin, and also of other Saints, may be had and retained; and that due honour and veneration are to be given them.

“ IX. I also affirm, that the power of Indulgences was left by Christ in the Church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people.

“ X. I acknowledge the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church, for the Mother and Mistress of all Churches, and I promise true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, successor to St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ.

“ XI. I likewise undoubtedly receive and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the Sacred Canons and General Councils, and particularly by the Holy Council of Trent; and I condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies, which the Church condemned, rejected, and anathematized.

“ XII. I, N. N., do at this present freely profess, and sincerely hold this true Catholic faith, without which no one can be saved; and I promise most constantly to retain and confess the same entire and inviolate, with God's assistance, to the end of my life.”

This Creed bears date December 9th, 1564. Its publication is in palpable opposition to the following decree of the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431 :—

“ These things having been read, the holy Synod decreed, THAT IT SHOULD BE LAWFUL FOR NO ONE TO PROFESS, TO WRITE, OR TO COMPOSE ANY OTHER FORM OF FAITH THAN THAT DEFINED BY THE HOLY FATHERS, WHO, WITH THE HOLY GHOST, HAD BEEN ASSEMBLED AT NICE. But those who shall have dared to compose, or to profess, or to offer ANY OTHER form of faith to those wishing to be converted to the acknowledgment of the truth, whether from Paganism or Judaism, or *from any sort of heresy*; that these, if they were bishops or clergymen, that the bishops should be *deposed* from their episcopacy, and the clergy from their clerical office; but that if they were laymen, they should be subjected to an anathema.”—*Mansi's Councils*, tome iii, p. 1343. Florence.

Not content with the above novelties, the Church of Rome requires her members to receive two new doctrines, namely, the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, declared by the Pope in 1854, and of the Pope's infallibility defined by the Vatican Council in 1870. If, therefore, it were needful to effect reformation in the 16th century, it is the more needful to maintain it now.

CHAPTER IV.

SERVICE BOOKS IN USE BEFORE THE REFORMATION.

THE Service Books in use are thus referred to in the “ Preface concerning the service of the Church :”—

“ And whereas heretofore there hath been great diversity in saying and singing in Churches within this realm; some following Salisbury use, some Hereford use, and some the use of Bangor, some of York, some of Lincoln; now from henceforth all the whole realm shall have but one use.”

The Missals, though differing in some respects, were essentially the same. The Missals, like the present Roman Missal, contained much that was superstitious

and unscriptural, and yet many of their expressions are inconsistent with the notion that Christ Himself is in the elements. Ridley and Latimer notice this fact as follows:—

“**RIDLEY.**—‘Upon the which vouchsafe to look with thy merciful and cheerful countenance.’ What meaneth this prayer for the Sacrament itself, if it be, as they say, the body of Christ, if it be God and man? How should the Father not look with a cheerful countenance upon His only well-beloved Son?

“**LATIMER.**—To this let them answer that so pray; except, peradventure, this prayer was used long before it was esteemed to be the body of Christ really and corporeally.”—*Works*, p. 109. P.S.

The Breviary (Portiforium, or Portus, Portuisse, Portifory) contained the offices for the Canonical hours, or Daily Service, namely, the Nocturns, Lauds, Prime, Tierce, Sext, Nones, Vespers, and Compline.

Nocturns were designed to take place at night, but were at length combined with Lauds or Matins, which were said at break of day.

Prime followed at 6 A.M.

Tierce occurred at the third hour, namely, 9 A.M.

Sext took place at noon.

Nones at 3 P.M., the ninth hour.

Vespers in the evening.

Compline (Complere, to finish), before rest.

The Hours were specially observed in the monastic institutions. They had been gradually introduced. The service consisted of prayers, psalms, hymns, canticles, and lessons, with marvellous legends.

Jewel makes the following reference to the Sarum Breviary in his reply to Harding:—

“Wherefore say ye thus of Thomas Becket, of whose sainthood, for ought that I know, ye may well stand in doubt. Tu per Thomæ sanguinem, quem pro te impedit, fac nos, Christe, scandere quo Thomas ascendit? ‘O Christ make us to ascend into Heaven, whither Thomas is ascended, even by the blood of Thomas that he shed for Thy sake.’ Here you seek not only intercession, but also salvation in the blood of Thomas.”—*Defence of Apology*, p. 573. P.S.

Pilkington, Bishop of Durham, contrasting the

public reading of Holy Scripture with the Breviary and the Missal says:—

“Our service hath nothing in it but it is written in God’s book, the Holy Bible (where no lie can be found), saving *Te Deum* and a few collects or prayers, which, although they be not contained in the Scripture, yet differing in words, they agree in sense and meaning with the articles of the faith and the whole body of the Scripture.’ Their *Portus* and *Missal* has many untrue fables and feigned miracles for their lessons, neither written in the Scripture, old history, nor ancient record of authority; many invocations of such as be no Saints, and wickedly calling on Saints of their own making, instead of the living God, as Thomas Becket and many Popes; some charms, as St. Agatha’s letters for burning of houses; some witchcrafts, as holy water for casting out devils, holy bread instead of the Communion, ringing the hallowed bell in great tempests or lightnings, and all in an unknown tongue, contrary to God’s commandment, yet craftily devised to deceive the people, lest in hearing them in their own tongue and proving them false they would laugh them to scorn.”—*Works*, p. 536. P.S.

The **Manual** contained the occasional offices, answering somewhat to the *Ordo administrandi sacramenta* now in use in the Church of Rome.

The **Pontifical** consisted of offices which pertained to the Bishop, such as ordination, confirmation, and consecration.

The **Horæ**, or “Hours of the Blessed Virgin, of the Cross and the Holy Spirit,” was used not only by Monks, but by Laity. Dr. Littledale observes, “Next whereas a hundred years is the extreme limit of human life, yet in the Hours of the B. V. M., according to the use of the Church of Sarum (Paris, 1526), Indulgences are promised for 500, 11,000, 30,755, and 56,000 years.”—*Plain Reasons for not joining the Church of Rome*, p. 102. S. P. C. K.

English versions of the “Hours” for the use of the laity may be traced to the 14th century. Manuals of a similar character were also in use. But Holy Scripture was inaccessible to the great mass of the people; even the clergy were unacquainted with it (*see chapter iii*).

CHAPTER V.

THE REVISION OF 1549.

THE Papal supremacy was renounced by Convocation in 1534. Bishops Gardiner and Bonner warmly supported the measure. Gardiner published an able refutation of papal claims under the title, *De vera obedientia*.

Translations of Scripture had appeared, Tyndale's in 1525, and Coverdale's in 1535, but were not licensed. A version bearing the name of Matthewe, but edited by Rogers, was published by licence in 1538. And, further, the Great Bible, with Preface by Cranmer, appeared in 1540. The King issued a proclamation in 1541 requiring the Bible to be set up in all churches. See "Cranmer's Works," pp. 81, 191, vol. ii. P.S.

The monasteries were suppressed in 1539.

Convocation in 1542 required that the curate of every parish church after the *Te Deum* and *Magnificat* should "openly read to the people one chapter of the New Testament in English without exposition, and when the New Testament was read over then to begin the Old."

The Litany, which had been previously translated into English, was revised by Cranmer. The following clauses, however, were retained:—

"Saint Mary, Mother of God, our Saviour Jesus Christ, pray for us.

All holy Angels and Archangels, and all holy orders of blessed Spirits, pray for us.

All holy Patriarchs and Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, Confessors and Virgins, and all the Blessed Company of Heaven, pray for us."

No effort was made as yet by authority to promote the doctrines of the Reformation.

"*The Institution of a Christian Man*," which was prepared in 1537 by a Royal Commission, though in

in some points in advance of former works, taught the doctrines of a Corporal Presence, the Mass, and Purgatory.

“*The Euridition of a Christian Man*,” which appeared in 1543, was even more unsatisfactory. This was due very much to the influence of Gardiner, who adhered tenaciously to mediæval doctrine.

In 1544, the King commanded that Litanies and prayers appointed for use in processions should be translated into English. This was the first step in the use of the vernacular in *public* services. So little was effected in ritual or doctrinal reform, that Hooper said, in 1546:—“Our King has destroyed the Pope but not Popery.”—*Orig. Letters*, p. 36, vol. i. P.S.

Henry died January 28th, 1547. Cranmer stood high in the estimation of young King Edward, and did not fail to employ his influence. Somerset, the Protector, cordially agreed with Cranmer.

Injunctions were issued in 1547 for the removal of images which had been abused.

In the same year, it was ordained that a chapter from the New Testament should be read at Matins, and a chapter from the Old at Evensong.

It was also required that the Epistle and Gospel should be read in English.

The first book of Homilies was now published with authority, and appointed to be read in churches.

The notorious Six Articles of 1536 were repealed, and private Masses abolished.

In 1548, an order of Council required the total removal of images which had been only partially abolished in 1547.

The First Reformed Prayer Book.—A Commission was appointed in 1547 to reform the offices of the Church; it consisted of the Archbishops, several Bishops, and some Doctors. They added an office of Communion in both kinds to the Mass, which was to be retained until other order.

The first revision of the services was accomplished in

1548, and the reformed Prayer Book was sanctioned by Act of Uniformity commanding it to be used on and after Whit-Sunday, June, 1549. A great change was thus effected in the public services of the Church which we can hardly estimate.

No longer were the Lessons read or the Services conducted in an unknown tongue. The people could now join intelligently in the prayers and psalmody of the Church. The elevation of the consecrated elements was forbidden. Images were removed, and many superstitious ceremonies swept away. But it was soon felt that a further revision was necessary.

The Book of 1549 retained the word “ALTAR ;” the mixed chalice ; wafer bread ; the sign of the cross  in the consecration prayer, and in the confirmation, and marriage services. It retained also prayers for the dead ; auricular confession as optional ; anointing of the sick, and *some* of the vestments of the Mass, with other objectionable points. The Judges in “Liddell and Westerton” remark :—

“At the date of the first Prayer Book of King Edward VI, the doctrine of the English Church as to the real presence and the nature of the Holy Communion was undecided : the book, therefore, enjoined no change in the form of the Altar, but spoke of the rite itself, as the Lord’s Supper commonly called the Mass, and of the structure indifferently by the names of the Altar and the Lord’s Table. It contains a prayer for the consecration of the sacred elements, in which the sign of the cross is to be used.”

Cranmer had held Lutheran opinions on the Lord’s Supper. But in December, 1548, it appeared that his views had undergone a decided change. John Ab Ullmis, writing to Bullinger, March 2nd, 1549, says :—

“The Archbishop of Canterbury, a man of singular worth and learning, has, contrary to the general expectation, delivered his opinion upon this subject learnedly, correctly, orderly, and clearly ; and by the weight of his character and the dignity of his language and sentiments, easily drew over all his hearers to our way of thinking.”—*Orig. Letters*, p. 388, vol. ii. P.S.

Ridley, Latimer and other Bishops adopted the same views. They were therefore prepared for a revision of

the book of 1549—a book which was unsatisfactory in a ritual point of view, and retained many doubtful and misleading expressions.

CHAPTER VI.

THE REVISION OF 1552.

The Altar as retained in the book of 1549, at least in terms, with other points, already noticed, was soon found to be inconsistent with the views of the leading reformers. Ridley, as Bishop of London, issued injunctions in which he commanded the clergy “to set up the Lord’s board after the form of an honest table,” for the following reasons, because “in divers places some use the Lord’s board after the form of a table, and some of an altar, whereby dissension is perceived to arise among the unlearned; therefore wishing a godly unity to be observed in all our diocese and for that the form of a table may more move and turn the simple from the old superstitious opinions of the Popish Mass, and to the right use of the Lord’s Supper.”—*Ridley’s Works*, p. 319. P.S.

In this matter, Ridley acted in accordance with a Royal order, directing that “all the altars in every church or chapel, as well in places exempted or not exempted, within your said diocese, be taken down.”—*Ridley’s Work*, Appendix VI. P.S.

CRANMER AND RIDLEY AS TO HEBREWS XIII. 10.—A similar order was given to other Bishops. Day, Bishop of Chichester, refused to comply, and was summoned before the Council. He, in his defence, referred to Hebrews xiii. 10, “*which place*,” says Strype, “by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London, was declared to be meant of Christ.”—*Eccles. Mem.* p. 328, vol. i. Oxford, 1812.

The opponents of the measure appealed to the word "Altar," as retained in the Prayer Book, to which it was replied that—

"The Book of Common Prayer calleth the thing, whereupon the Lord's Supper is ministered indifferently, a table, an altar, or the Lord's board."—*Ridley's Works*, p. 322. P.S.

Ridley adds :—

"The Popish opinion of Mass was that it might not be celebrated but upon an altar . . . wherefore it is more meet for the abolition of this superstitious opinion to have the Lord's board after the form of a table than of an altar."—*Ibid.*

The expurgation of the word **Altar** from the Prayer Book was therefore necessary.

Moreover, Ridley enjoined that "No minister do counterfeit the Romish Mass."—*Works*, p. 319. P.S.

But the book of 1549 contained the following words at the head of the Communion Office:—"The Supper of the Lord and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass." The words "commonly called the Mass" did not imply that the Communion was the Mass, but simply that it was generally known by that term. Still the expression was calculated to mislead.

There were numerous other points which called for review.

BUKER AND MARTYR.—Meanwhile Cranmer, who was desirous of proceeding with great caution, invited Martin Bucer, and Peter Martyr, and others to England—a fact which is thus noticed by Archbishop Parker:—

"Archbishop Cranmer that he might strengthen the evangelical doctrine in the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford, from which an infinite number of teachers go forth for the instruction of the whole kingdom, called into England the most celebrated Divines from foreign nations, Peter Martyr Vermilius, a Florentine, and Martin Bucer, a German from Strasburgh. The former taught at Oxford; the latter at Cambridge."—*Antiq. Brittan*, p. 508, edit. 1729.

The Book of Common Prayer was placed in the hands of Bucer and Martyr for their opinion. They made many suggestions, and their opinions had much weight, but were not always adopted. For example,

Bucer urged that the words in the delivery of the elements should be retained, "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life," and the corresponding words in the delivery of the cup, but his advice was not taken.

Gardiner professed to accept the book of 1549, but he was hostile to any further change. The king, however, informed Sir John Cheke that if the bishops would not consent to a further reformation, he would "interpose the authority of his own Majesty."—*Orig. Letters*, p. 495, vol. ii. P.S.

There is no doubt that Cranmer and Ridley had the chief hand in revision. Peter Martyr, who was closely associated with Cranmer, in anticipation of the revision of 1552, says in reference to him—

"I am persuaded that if the business were committed to his individual hand, purity of ceremonies would without difficulty have been attained by him."—*Letter to Bucer, Feb. 1551, Gorham's Refor. Gleanings*, p. 232.

The Act of Uniformity was passed on the 6th of April, 1552, and the book came into use on the feast of All Saints', November 1st.

The following are the leading changes which were effected :—

Cmissions.—Introits; the expression commonly called "the Mass;" the word "Altar;" the mixing of water with wine; the invocation of the Holy Ghost on the elements; the sign of the cross in the consecration of the elements; the "Agnus Dei" sung during Communion; the allusion to the angels as bearing up our prayers to the heavenly tabernacle; prayer for the departed in the prayer for the whole Church, and in the burial service; the option as to auricular confession; the reservation of the consecrated elements for the sick; the rubric as to the use of vestment or cope, alb, &c.; the benediction of water in the baptismal service; chrism, or anointing in baptism, and the visitation of

the sick ; chrisom, or the white robe in baptism ; the Holy Communion at funerals.

Additions.—The sentences, exhortation, confession and absolution at the beginning of Morning and Evening Prayer ; a rubric allowing the communion table to stand in the body of the church ; the Commandments and responses in the Communion Service ; a new exhortation to the negligent in the Communion Service by Peter Martyr ; the words “*Militant here on earth*” in the title of the Prayer for “the whole state of Christ’s Church ;” the declaration against corporal presence, appended by order of Council to the Communion Service.

Changes.—The Service appointed to be said where the people could best hear ; common bread in the Holy Communion instead of wafer bread ; the words that “we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood,” instead of that “they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ.”

There were other alterations.

CHAPTER VII.

THE REVISIONS OF 1559 AND 1604.

ELIZABETH ascended the throne on the 17th of November, 1558. In the preceding reign, the Royal Supremacy had been abolished and the Mass restored. The Queen immediately forbade the elevation of the Host, and directed that the Litany, the Creed, the Lord’s Prayer, and the Epistle and Gospel should be read in English. Parliament met on the 23rd January, 1559, and passed an act for the restoration of the Royal Supremacy.

THE PRAYER BOOK.—In December, 1558, a Committee was appointed to consult as to the public services of the Church. It consisted of Parker, Bill, May, Cox, Grindal, Whitehead and Pilkington. Parker being laid aside by illness, Guest was appointed to take his place. They were directed “to compare both King Edward’s books together, and from them both to frame a book for the use of the Church of England.”

The book of 1552 was adopted with some alterations, which are thus noticed by the Act of Uniformity of 1559—“with one alteration or addition of certain Lessons to be used on every Sunday in the year, and the form of the Litany altered and corrected, and two sentences only added in the delivery of the Sacrament to the communicants, and none other or otherwise.” The alterations referred to consisted in the appointment of special Lessons for the Sunday; the omission of the deprecation in the Litany—“From the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities, Good Lord deliver us,” and the combination of the forms of address to the communicant appointed by the books of 1549 and 1552. The words in the book of 1549 were as follow:—“The body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life;” “The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.” The words in the book of 1552 were:—“Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving;” “Drink this in remembrance that Christ’s blood was shed for thee, and be thankful.”

Besides the above, the new rubric directed morning and evening prayer “to be used in the accustomed place of the church, chapel, or chancel.” Some other alterations of a trivial character were made.

THE VESTMENTS REGULATED BY ACT OF PARLIAMENT.—The rubric of 1552 prescribed as follows:—

“And here is to be noted, that the Minister at the time of the

communion, and at all other times in his ministration, shall use neither Alb, Vestment, nor Cope : but being Archbishop, or Bishop, he shall have and wear a rochet : and being a Priest or Deacon, he shall have and wear a surplice only."

The Act of 1559 made special provision on the subject which will be noticed elsewhere, and thus though it authorized the above book, it neutralized the above rubric. That which appears as a rubric in the book of 1559 was, in reality, a mere note of reference to the Act of 1559. The Act made a provisional arrangement as follows :—

" Provided always, and be it enacted that such ornaments of the church and of the ministers thereof shall be retained, and be in use, as was in the Church of England by authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth, *until other order shall be therein taken by the authority of the Queen's Majesty*, with the advice of *her Commissioners*, appointed and authorized under the great seal of England for causes Ecclesiastical, or of the Metropolitan of this realm."

The post Communion declaration had been added, by order of Council on the 27th of October, 1552, to the Prayer Book which had been established by Act of Uniformity on 6th of April, 1552. As it had not appeared in the original book, it was considered unnecessary to retain it. This declaration, however, was placed in the Prayer Book in 1662.

As it regards the ornaments of the minister, the Queen exercised the authority given to her by the Act, and took "other order" by the publication of the Injunctions in 1559, and the Advertisements in 1565-6.

The former required the prelates and clergy to—

" Use and wear such seemly habits, garments and such square caps as were most commonly and orderly received in the latter years of the reign of King Edward VI, not thereby meaning to attribute any holiness or special worthiness to the said garments, but as St. Paul writeth, " *Omnia decenter et secundum ordinem fiant.*" 1 Cor. 14 cap."—*Sparrow's Collections*, No. 30. Lond., 1671.

The Advertisements directed that surplices should be worn by the celebrant in saying the prayers and administering the Sacraments in parish churches, and the cope in the administration of the Holy Communion,

in cathedral and collegiate churches (see chap. xii.). The Mass vestments and utensils were everywhere destroyed. The Judges in the Ridsdale Case state the following facts:—

“ After 1566, vestments, albs and tunicles (copes also in parish and non-collegiate churches) are mentioned in the official acts of the Bishops and others, performed in the public exercise of their legal jurisdiction, only as things associated with superstition, and to be defaced and destroyed. They were so treated by a Royal Commission sent to Oxford by Queen Elizabeth in 1573, and by the Visitation Articles of Archbishops Grindal and Sandys (York, 1571 and 1578) and Abbott and Laud (1611 and 1637) of Bishops Aylmer, Bancroft, and King (London, 1577, 1601 and 1612), and others.”

THE REVISION OF 1604.

When King James the First ascended the throne, March 24, 1603-4. A petition was presented to him in April, signed, as Hallam states, by 825 of the clergy, setting forth their objections to the surplice, the cross in baptism, the ring in marriage, and other points. This petition has been described as millenary in reference to the number of names attached to it.

HAMPTON COURT CONFERENCE.—The King, therefore, convened a meeting which took place at Hampton Court, January 14-18, 1604, consisting of the Primate, and several Bishops, and other Divines in order to discuss the whole question. The objectors were represented by Dr. Rainolds and Dr. Sparke, Mr. Knewstubbs and Mr. Chadderton. The discussion lasted three days, an account of which is given by Barlow, Dean of Chester, who took part in the meeting.

The Conference resulted in the introduction of the words “or remission of sins” into the title of the Absolution, the addition of the questions and answers regarding the Sacraments to the Catechism, the addition of the thanksgivings “for rain,” “for fair weather,” “for plenty,” “for peace, and deliverance from our enemies,” “for deliverance from the plague.” The thanksgiving “for restoring public peace at home” was added in 1662.

The words "lawful minister" were substituted in the rubric preceding the service "of the ministration of private baptism of children" for words which allowed "one of them" present to baptize the child. The word "lawful" was *transposed* in 1662.

One of the Puritan representatives, Dr. Sparke, became a strong advocate for entire conformity. He published an able work, entitled "A Brotherly persuasion to Unity and Conformity," in which he shows that the surplice "with long and large sleeves," "as it is prescribed to us," is not an "idolatrous mass garment." He refers to "the other order" as taken by the Queen in the Advertisements of 1565-6. The book is out of print, but a copy may be consulted in the library of the British Museum.

The version of the Bible of 1611 resulted from this Conference.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE REVISION OF 1662.

KING CHARLES II ascended the throne May 29th, 1660. He issued a declaration, October 25th, in which he referred to the Presbyterians as "modestly" desirous "of such alterations in either" (Episcopacy and Liturgy) as "without shaking foundations might best allay present distempers" (Cardwell's "Hist. of Conf.," p. 245). The king recommended "concession and abatement on both sides," and desired the Puritans to lay before him their proposals in due form. They accordingly drew up a paper, in which they expressed their disapproval of kneeling in the Lord's Supper, of the use of the surplice, and bowing at the name of Jesus. They prayed that such holidays as are of human institution might not be imposed upon them, and more especially that moderate divines on both sides might be employed to revise the Liturgy.

His Majesty, in the declaration already referred to, made provisional arrangements, and satisfied the demands of the Puritans “as to the sanctification of the Lord’s Day, the admission to the Lord’s Supper, the rite of Confirmation, the limitation of episcopal jurisdiction, the appointment of suffragans, the non-requirement of oaths and subscriptions, the discretionary use of the Liturgy, and the non-observance of the prescribed ceremonies.”—*Cardwell’s Conf.*, p. 256.

THE SAVOY CONFERENCE.—A Royal Commission was issued on the 25th March, 1661, appointing certain bishops on the one hand and Presbyterian divines on the other “to advise upon and review the Book of Common Prayer.” The Commissioners met “in the Master’s lodgings in the Savoy, in the Strand,” on the 15th of April, 1661.

The Puritans, among whom Richard Baxter took the lead, presented in writing a long list of *exceptions* or objections, to which the bishops gave a reply in detail. It was soon apparent that the Commission was fruitless. It terminated on the 24th of July, 1661, with much estrangement of feeling on both sides.

The Royal Commission having failed, the matter of revision rested with Convocation, which had assembled on the 8th of May, 1661.

CONVOCATION REVISES.—This Synod entered upon the work of revision on the 21st of the following November, and brought it to a close on the 20th of December. The Act of Uniformity received the royal assent on the 19th of May 1662, and the revised Prayer Book came into use on the 24th August, 1662.

CONCESSIONS TO THE PURITANS.—In this revision, some alterations were made according to the suggestion of the Puritan Commissioners of the Savoy. Thus the Doxology was added to the Lord’s Prayer, the rubric which directed the Lessons to be sung was amended, the first prayer in the Baptismal Service relating to the waters of Jordan was altered, the rubric requiring the celebration of the Lord’s Supper at marriages was

modified, the rubric as to the position of the woman in Churching was also modified, new Psalms were appointed in the Churching Service, several Collects, to which objection had been made, were altered, a General Thanksgiving, composed by Bishop Reynolds, was added to the Service; the declaration on kneeling was restored. Of these, the most important is the last.

Effect upon the Romanists.—Bishop Burnet remarks :—

“The Papists were highly offended when they saw such an express declaration made against the real presence; and the Duke told me that when he asked Sheldon how they came to declare against a doctrine which, he had been instructed, was the doctrine of the Church, Sheldon answered, ‘Ask Gauden about it, who is a Bishop of your own making;’ for the King had ordered his promotion for the service he had done.”—*Burnet’s History of his own Times*, p. 315, vol. i. Oxf. 1823.

Effect upon the Puritans.—This declaration was received as a satisfactory explanation of the attitude of kneeling in the Lord’s Supper. A large number of the Puritans conformed, alleging that “kneeling is freed from all superstition by the annexing of the rubric out of King Edward the VIth’s Common Prayer Book which, though Convocation refused, the Parliament annexed.”*—*Reliq. Bax.*, by *Sylvester*, p. 390. Lond. 1796.

Baxter was disappointed that the secession did not embrace a larger number of the clergy, of whom 10,000, as he states, had conformed to the requirements of the Commonwealth, and used the Puritan Directory. He expresses wonder that 7000 consented to the new book.—*Ibid.*

REACTIONARY EFFORTS.—An effort was made in Convocation to introduce some points of an opposite character. For example, it was proposed to place the table at a fixture in the chancel; that the priest should “offer up” the elements when placing them on the

* This confirms the opinion of Swainson and others, that Parliament interfered.—See *Swainson’s Parliamentary Hist. of the Act of Uniformity*. Bell, Lond., 1875.

table; that wafer-bread should be allowed; that the words "militant here on earth" should be omitted in the title of the prayer "for the whole state of Christ's Church :" but these propositions were rejected.

CHAPTER IX.

THE ACTS OF UNIFORMITY, THE PREFACE, AND NOTICES.

THE SEALED Books.—The Acts of Uniformity, 1559 and 1662, are affixed to the Sealed Books, that is, copies of the original book under the Great Seal, required by the above Act of 1662. The Sealed Books are in the custody of the Capitular bodies, and of the Courts of Westminster and other Courts. They are the legal standards.

The judges in the Ridsdale case observe as to the Act of Uniformity, 1559 :—

"It is of importance to bear in mind that the Ornaments' Rubric, which it is now contended contains the whole enactment or law relating to the vesture of the clergy, was not when originally introduced in 1559, and was not meant to be, an enactment at all, and it, in fact, ended with a reference to the statute 1 Elizabeth, cap. 2, set out in the beginning of the Prayer Book in terms which showed that the Rubric claimed no intrinsic authority for itself."

This is an important consideration in its bearing as we shall see on the Ornaments' Rubric.

A proviso existed in the Act of Uniformity as it left the House of Lords in April, 1662, which would have afforded relief to the Puritans. It provided that in certain conditions, "No such minister shall be deprived for not wearing the surplice or for not signing with the sign of the cross in baptism."

It provided also that a pension should be paid to deprived clergymen of "peaceable disposition" not exceeding a fifth part of the income of his forfeited

benefice. These conciliatory measures were rejected by the House of Commons.—See “The Parliamentary History of the Act of Uniformity,” by Canon Swainson. London, 1875.

The Preface of our Prayer Book, as it is, was composed in 1662, and has been attributed to Bishop Sanderson. It sets forth the principles upon which the last revision had proceeded. The alterations were made, as it explains, (1) “for the better direction” of the “clergy, and this chiefly in Calendars and Rubrics;” (2) for “the more proper expressing of some words or phrases of ancient usage;” and (3) for the introduction of the new translation “into the Epistles and Gospels especially.” The revisers did not admit “the necessity of making the said alterations,” but assented unto such as seem to them “in any degree requisite or expedient,” “*by what persons, under what pretences, or to what purpose soever so tendered.*” This is an important statement, for it proves that *no new doctrinal principle* was introduced in 1662. The revisers evidently refer to the suggestions of the Puritans in the words last quoted above, some of which suggestions were acted upon.—See p. 35.

The Notice “concerning the Service of the Church” was composed as the Preface to the first reformed Prayer Book (1549). Cranmer was probably its author. It relates mainly to the reading of *the Word of God*. It states that the public reading of Scripture in pre-reformation times was rendered ineffectual “by the planting in uncertain stories and legends, with multitude of responds, verses, vain repetitions, commemorations and synodals,” and by its being read to the people in Latin. It adds:—“For this cause be cut off Anthems, Responds, Invitatories and such like things which break the continuous course of the reading of the Scripture.”

Anthems or Antiphons in the mediæval service denoted a sentence sometimes from Scripture sung before and after the Psalms. The following is an example from the Sarum office:—

"In the first nocturn the Antiphon: The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor the ruler from his thigh : until he come who is to be sent. *Ps.* Blessed is the man. *Ps.* Wherefore rage the heathen. *Ps.* Lord, why are they increased. *Ps.* Lord, not in wrath. *Under one Gloria Patri.* *Antiphon.* He will be the expectation of all nations, and he will wash his own garment in wine, and his robe in the blood of the grape. *Psalms.* O Lord my God. O Lord our God. I will confess. In the Lord, I trust. *Under one Gloria.* *Antiphon.* His eyes are fairer than wine, and his teeth whiter than milk."

Legends denote the lives of Saints which contain so many absurdities that the word has come to signify an unauthentic narrative. The Breviary abounds in marvellous stories.

The Responds consisted of a short anthem in the middle of a Lesson. The following is an example of *responds* and *verses* from the Sarum office:—

"Second Lesson.—The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib. But Israel hath not known me, and my people hath not understood. Ah, sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, an ungodly seed, wicked children. They have forsaken the Lord, blasphemed the holy one of Israel, they have gone away backward. These things He saith. Respond. I saw in the vision of night, and lo, in the clouds of heaven, the Son of Man came. And the kingdom and the honour are given to him: and every people, tribe, and tongue shall obey him. Vers. His power is an everlasting power, which shall not be taken away; and his kingdom shall not be destroyed. And the kingdom and the honour are given to him."

Commemorations.—Clay remarks that "they mean collects and antiphons, &c., continued for a day or two after, as the case might be, or an octave of the festival itself."—*Elizabethan Liturgies*, p. 304. P.S.

Synodals were decrees of Synods.

Invitatories were texts of Scripture having reference to the day, used before and after every second verse of the *Venite*, which is designated the Invitatory. The following is an example from the Sarum Matins:—

"Let the invitatory follow in this manner. Lo, the King comes. Let us go forth to meet our Saviour. Ps. O come. After i, iii, and v verses of the Psalm let the whole invitatory be repeated. But after ii, iii, and vi verses of the Psalm let this part alone be repeated, Let us go forth. And then let the whole invitatory be recommenced. The hymn, the supernal word, going forth," &c.

The Notice "of Ceremonies, why some be abolished and some retained," was composed for the book of 1549, in which it stood after the Communion Service.

CHAPTER X.

SECTION I.

THE CALENDAR AND LESSONS.

Read

THE word calends (*calendæ*) denoted among the Romans the first day of each month. The *Calendarium* was a pocket or account book, with the days of the year marked in the margin. Calendars were used at an early date, but the most ancient extant according to M. Chastelet is that which was completed in the 4th century under Julius, Bishop of Rome, A.D. 336. This was republished in Anvers in 1634, by Bucherius in his "Commentary on the Paschal Cycle." It is remarkable that it contains the *Pagan* as well as the Christian festivals.

"The Tables and Rules for the Movable and Immovable Feasts."

The Eastern Christians, in the Early Ages, observed Easter on the 14th of Nisan, the day on which the pascal lamb was slain, and were, therefore, called *Quartodecimans*.

The Western Church kept the feast on the Sunday following. Both sections of the Church adhered tenaciously to their own practice, and at first agreed to differ. Eusebius refers to the Conference which took place in the middle of the 2nd century on this subject, between Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, and Anicetus, Bishop of Rome:—

"For neither could Anicetus persuade Polycarp not to observe it, because he had always observed it with John, the disciple of our Lord, and the rest of the Apostles with whom he associated; and

neither did Polycarp persuade Anicetus to observe it, who said he was bound to maintain the practice of the Presbyters before him.
—*Hist.*, Book v, c. 24.

Eusebius states that the bishops partook together of the Lord's Supper, Polycarp consecrating, and "separated in peace."—*Ibid.*

This forbearance was broken later in the same century by Victor, Bishop of Rome, who attempted by excommunication to cut off the Eastern churches. But, says Eusebius, "this was not the opinion of all the bishops." They exhorted him to pursue a course calculated "to promote unity, peace, and love."—*Ibid.*

The question was brought before the Council of Nice, A.D. 325, which ruled in favour of the usage of the Western Church. The rule, however, which it established for finding Easter was open to criticism.—See Act Geo. II, p. 42.

THE TABLES SET ASIDE.—The Tables to find Easter which had been sanctioned by Convocation in 1662 were set aside by Act 24 Geo. II, entitled:—"An Act for regulating the commencement of the year, and for correcting the Calendar now in use." A new Calendar, Tables, and Rules were appointed in room of the old.

The Act deals with two important matters:—(1) the commencement of the year, and (2) the correction of the Calendar.

Commencement of the Year.—As to the former (1) Dr. Stephens remarks:—

"In England in the 7th and so late as the 13th century, the civil year was reckoned from Christmas Day; but in the 12th century the Anglican Church began the year on the 25th of March, which practice was also adopted by civilians in the 14th century. This style continued until the reformation of the Calendar by Stat. 24 Geo. II, c. 23, by which the legal year was ordered to commence on the 1st of January, 1753. It appears, therefore, that two periods have generally co-existed in England for the commencement of the year. (1) The historical year has for a very long period begun on the 1st of January; and (2) the civil, ecclesiastical, and legal year, which was used by the Church and in all public instruments, began at Christmas until the end of the 13th century, and after that time commenced on the 25th of

March, and so continued until the 1st of January, 1753. Consequently, the Church and civilians referred every event which happened between the 1st of January and the 25th of March to a different year from historians."

Gregory XIII in the 16th century had published a new Calendar, and "ordered that ten days should be deducted from the year 1582, so that the 5th of October would be accounted as the 15th. He directed also that the year should begin on the 1st of January, but his direction, or the new style as it was termed, was not universally adopted.

These two methods of computation caused considerable confusion. For example, Bucer's "Criticism upon the Prayer Book was delivered to the Bishop of Ely, January 5, 1551." And it has been argued that this means January 5, 1552—a date at which Bucer suggestions would have been too late. But it is clear that Bucer, as a Continentalist, wrote according to the new style, for he died in February, 1551. Peter Martyr records the fact of his decease in a letter written in October, 1551.—*Original Letters*, p. 495, vol. i. P.S.

Thus also King Charles the Ist was beheaded according to some writers, January 30th, 1648, but according to others, January 30th, 1649.

The Act having referred to the inconvenience of the two styles of computation sets forth first that:—

"The Calendar then in use, commonly called the Julian Calendar, had been discovered to be erroneous, by means whereof the Vernal or Spring Equinox, which at the time of the General Council of Nice, A.D. 325, happened on or about the 21st day of March, then happened on the 9th or 10th of the same month, and that that error was still increasing, and, if not remedied, would, in process of time, occasion the several equinoxes and solstices to fall at very different times in the civil year from what they formerly did, which might tend to mislead persons ignorant of such alteration; that a method of correcting the Calendar (in such manner as that the equinoxes and solstices might for the future fall nearly on the same nominal days on which the same happened at the time of the said General Council) had been received and established, and was then generally practised by almost all other nations of Europe. . . . Enacted by Sec. 1, that the said suppuration (computation), according to which the year of our Lord began on the 25th day of March, should not be made use of from and after the last day of December, 1751, and that the first day of January

next following the last day of December should be reckoned, taken, deemed, and accounted to be the first day of the year of our Lord, 1752."

Easter.—Secondly as to Easter, after reciting "that, according to the then rule prefixed to the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England, Easter Day was always the first Sunday after the first full moon, which then happened the next after the 21st of March, and if the full moon happened on a Sunday, Easter Day was the Sunday after, which rule was made in conformity to the decree of the said General Council of Nice for the celebration of the said feast of Easter; and that the method of computing the full moons then used in the Church of England, and according to which 'the table to find Easter for ever,' prefixed to the said Book of Common Prayer, was formed, was, by process of time, become considerably erroneous," it was enacted that

"The said feast of Easter, or of any of the movable feasts theron depending, shall from and after the said second day of September, be no longer kept or observed in that part of Great Britain called England, or in any other dominions or countries subject or belonging to the Crown of Great Britain, according to the said method of supputation then used, or the said table prefixed to the said Book of Common Prayer, and that the said table, and also the column of Golden Numbers, as they were then prefixed to the respective days of the month in the said Calendar, should be left out in all future editions of the said Book of Common Prayer and that the said new Calendar, Tables and Rules thereunto annexed should be prefixed to all such future editions of the said book in the room and stead thereof."

The Act provided for the omission of eleven days from the 2nd of September, so that in the year 1752 September consisted only of nineteen days, and thus the new style already existing on the continent was adopted in England.

The "Golden Number" is thus termed from its golden letters.

It indicates the place which a year occupies in the Metonic cycle. Meton, an astronomer of Athens, who lived more than four hundred years before Christ, seeing that a difference of about eleven days existed between

the solar and lunar years, discovered that the periods of revolution of the sun and moon coincided every nineteen years, which interval has been designated “the Metonic cycle.”

The rule for finding the Golden Number is thus explained in the Calendar:—

“To find the Golden Number, or Prime, add one to the year of our Lord, and then divide by 19. The remainder, if any, is the Golden Number. But if nothing remaineth then 19 is the Golden Number.”

“The Epact” (from *ἐπακτός*, imported) “denotes,” says Dr. Stephens,

“The excess of the common solar year above the lunar, by which the age of the moon in any year may be found, and a table of epacts is a table of differences between the solar and the lunar year. The Epact of any year indicates the moon’s age on the 1st day of January in that year. If the new moon happens on the 1st of January the Epact of that year is zero, or 0. As the lunar year of 354 is shorter than the solar year of 365 days by eleven days, this difference will run through every year of the lunar cycle. Thus the Epact of the first year of the cycle is 11, because 11 days are to be added to the lunar in order to complete the solar year; the Epact of the second year of the cycle is 22; the Epact of the third year is 33, less by 30—*i.e.*, 3, because the moon’s age cannot exceed thirty days. The Epact of the fourth year of the cycle is 14, and so on until the last year of the cycle, the Epact of which is 29; and the Epact of the first year of the next cycle is 11, as before.”

The Dominical letters, A, B, C, D, E, F, G, denoting in succession the days of the week. The letter indicative of Sunday is the Dominical or Sunday letter:—

“A marks the first day of the year, B the second, C the third, and so on. And the one of these which denotes Sundays is the Dominical letter. Thus if the year commence on Sunday A is the Dominical letter. If it begin on Monday the Dominical letter is G—that is, the first Sunday in January will occur on the 7th; if it begin on Tuesday the Dominical letter will be F—that is, the first Sunday will occur on the 6th.”

SECTION II.

THE LESSONS.

THE PRINCIPLES INVOLVED.—The Preface to the book of 1549, entitled “of the Service of the Church,” gives

the principles by which the Reformers were guided in the construction of the Table of Lessons.

The public reading of Scripture before the Reformation had not only been conducted in a tongue which the people "understood not," but was interrupted, as the preface states, by "Anthems, Responds, Invitatories, and such like things, as break the continued course of the reading of Scripture." Thus, "when any book of the Bible was begun, after three or four chapters were read out, all the rest was unread." Moreover, "the hardness of the rules called the Pie," by which the order of service was regulated, was so great "that many times there was more business to find out what should be read than to read it when it was found out. These inconveniences therefore considered, here is set forth such an order whereby the same shall be redressed. And for a readiness in this matter, here is drawn out a Kalendar for that purpose which is plain and easy to be understood." The Church thus provides for the orderly and consecutive reading of Holy Scripture.

The reading of lessons has always occupied an important place in the public worship of the Church of God. Nicholls observes that "the primitive Christians derived their most excellent custom of reading the Scriptures in course from the Jews," and he quotes Philo who describes the practice of his countrymen as follows:—

"They come into one common place; and sitting together in silence and modesty, hear the law read; that no one of them might plead ignorance of the obligation thereof. And this is the constant manner of their assembly."—*Comment. on Prayer Book, notes on Preface.*

It was so in the times of the Lord Jesus, who read the lessons in the Synagogue on the Sabbath day.
—*Luke iv. 17.*

Justin Martyr refers to the practice of Christians as follows:—

"And on the day that is called Sunday there is an assembly in the same place of those who dwell in towns, or in the country, and

the histories of the apostles, and the writings of the prophets are read, whilst the time permits; then, the reader ceasing, the President verbally admonishes and exhorts to the imitation of these good things.”—1st *Apol.*, chap. lxvii.

The notice “concerning the Service of the Church,” states that “the Fathers so ordered the matter that all the whole Bible (or the greater part thereof) should be read over once every year,” and it adds that “this decent and godly order of the ancient Fathers” “these many years past” hath been “altered, broken and neglected,” as intimated in the passage already quoted.

New Lectionary.—An Act was passed, 13th July, 1871, 34 and 35 Victoria, entitled “The Prayer Book (Tables of Lessons) Act,” giving effect to a report which had been presented by a Commission appointed by Her Majesty to “inquire and to consider” the table of lessons. The Act sets out “the existing directions prefixed to the Prayer Book to be omitted for the future” and “the directions to be prefixed to the Prayer Book in lieu” thereof. We now give from the Act the former directions, and also those which are now in force by virtue of the Act. The reader in the comparison of the two can at once perceive the general principle of the revision. Its leading features are the addition of portions not before read in public, and the omission of the greater part of the Apocrypha; the reading of the Epistles as lessons in the morning and of the Gospels and Acts in the evening; the alteration of many lessons, and a new division with a view both to subject and brevity.

FIRST PART.

Existing Directions prefixed to the Prayer Book to be omitted in future.

THE ORDER HOW THE REST OF HOLY SCRIPTURE IS APPOINTED TO BE READ.

The Old Testament is appointed for the First Lessons at Morning and Evening Prayer, so as the most part thereof will be read every year once, as in the Calendar is appointed.

The New Testament is appointed for the Second Lessons at Morning and Evening Prayer, and shall be read over orderly

every year thrice, besides the Epistles and Gospels, except the Apocalypse, out of which there are only certain Proper Lessons appointed upon divers feasts.

And to know what Lessons shall be read every day, look for the day of the month in the Calendar following, and there ye shall find the chapters that shall be read for the Lessons, both at Morning and Evening Prayer, except only the movable feasts, which are not in the Calendar, and the immovable, where there is a blank left in the column of Lessons, the Proper Lessons for all which days are to be found in the Table of Proper Lessons.

And note that whensoever Proper Psalms or Lessons are appointed, then the Psalms and Lessons of ordinary course appointed in the Psalter and Calendar (if they be different) shall be omitted for that time.

Note also that the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel appointed for the Sunday shall serve all the week after where it is not in this Book otherwise ordered.

SECOND PART.

Directions to be prefixed to the Prayer Book in lieu of the Directions in the First Part of this Schedule.

THE ORDER HOW THE REST OF HOLY SCRIPTURE IS APPOINTED TO BE READ.

The Old Testament is appointed for the First Lessons at Morning and Evening Prayer, so as the most part thereof will be read every year once, as in the Calendar is appointed.

The New Testament is appointed for the Second Lessons at Morning and Evening Prayer, and shall be read over orderly every year twice, once in the morning and once in the evening, besides the Epistles and Gospels, except the Apocalypse, out of which there are only certain Lessons appointed at the end of the year, and certain proper Lessons appointed upon divers feasts.

And to know what Lessons shall be read every day, look for the day of the month in the Calendar following, and there ye shall find the chapters and portions of chapters that shall be read for the Lessons, both at Morning and Evening Prayer, except only the movable feasts, which are not in the Calendar, and the immovable, where there is a blank left in the column of Lessons, the Proper Lessons for all which days are to be found in the Table of Proper Lessons.

If Evening Prayer is said at two different times in the same place of worship on any Sunday (except a Sunday for which alternative Second Lessons are specially appointed in the table), the Second Lesson at the second time may, at the discretion of the minister, be any chapter from the four Gospels, or any Lesson appointed in the Table of Lessons from the four Gospels.

Upon occasions, to be approved by the Ordinary, other Lessons may, with his consent, be substituted for those which are appointed in the Calendar.

And note that whensoever Proper Psalms or Lessons are appointed, then the Psalms and Lessons of ordinary course appointed in the Psalter and Calendar (if they be different) shall be omitted for that time.

Note also that upon occasions to be appointed by the Ordinary, other Psalms may, with his consent, be substituted for those appointed in the Psalter.

If any of the Holy-days for which Proper Lessons are appointed in the table fall upon a Sunday which is the first Sunday in Advent, Easter Day, Whitsunday, or Trinity Sunday, the Lessons appointed for such Sunday shall be read, but if it fall upon any other Sunday, the Lessons appointed either for the Sunday or for the Holy-day may be read at the discretion of the minister.

Note also that the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel appointed for the Sunday shall serve all the week after, where it is not in this Book otherwise ordered.

CHAPTER XI.

FESTIVALS AND FASTS.

HOLY DAYS.—The following table gives “all the Feasts that are to be observed in the Church of England through the year.” “All Sundays in the year. The Circumcision of our Lord Jesus Christ. The Epiphany. The Conversion of S. Paul. The Purification of the Blessed Virgin. S. Mathias the Apostle. The Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin. S. Mark the Evangelist. S. Philip and S. Jacob the Apostles. The Ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ. S. Barnabas. The Nativity of St. John Baptist. S. Peter the Apostle. S. James the Apostle. S. Bartholomew the Apostle. S. Matthew the Apostle. S. Michael, and All Angels. S. Luke the Evangelist. S. Simon and S. Jude the Apostles. All Saints. S. Andrew the Apostle. S. Thomas the Apostle. The Nativity of our Lord. S. Stephen the Martyr. S. John the Evangelist. The Holy Innocents. Monday and Tuesday in Easter Week. Monday and Tuesday in Whitsun Week.”—*From the Sealed Books.*

Here is no day of doubtful import.

Black Letter Days.—Other days in the Calendar are printed in black letter, but they are not to be observed.

The facts regarding the days are these. The Reformers retained only the following days of observance in the book of 1549, commencing with January,—Circumcision, Epiphany, Conversion of Paul, Purification of Mary, Matthias, the Annunciation, Mark Evangelist, Philip and James, Barnabas, Nativity of John the Baptist, S. Peter, Magdalen, James Apostle, Bartholomew Apostle, Matthew, Michael, Luke Evangelist, Simon and Jude, All Saints', Andrew Apostle, Thomas Apostle, Nativity of our Lord, Stephen, John the Evangelist, Innocents.

The following names were added to the Calendar in the book of 1552:—St. George, St. Laurence, and St. Clement. Several, however, of the rejected names appear in the Primer of 1553 to mark the seasons for public convenience.

The Act of Uniformity of 1559 adopted the Calendar of the book of 1552.

The Latin Prayer Book of 1560, and the *Preces Privatae* of 1564, attach a name to almost every day in the Calendar.

In 1661, a Royal Commission consisting of Parker, Grindal, and others, was appointed to revise the Calendar of 1552, authorized in 1559. They added several names to the Calendar of 1552, which still remain.

Important Monition.—The reason for the addition is assigned in a monition in the *Preces Privatae* which appeared in 1564. The Monition sets forth that “the names of Saints, so-called,” were inserted in that book, not in the belief that they were all godly but for public convenience, as “some Notes and Indexes of appointed seasons.”* This important

* The monition *in extenso* is as follows:—Ubi in Calendario, singulis fere diebus uniuscujusque mensis, sanctorum (quos vocant) nomina apposuimus, Id eo fecimus, amice lector, non quod eos omnes pro divis habeamus, quorum aliquos ne in bonis quidem ducimus; aut quod alioqui (si sanctissimi sint) iis divinum cultum atque honorem tribuendum censeamus; sed ut certarum

document, which seems to have been unknown to Wheatly, completely establishes his statement that the black letter days were retained

“ Upon account of our Courts of Justice, which usually make their returns on these days, or else upon the days before or after them, which are called in the writs *Vigil. Fest. or Crast.*, as in *Vigil. Martin*; *Fest. Martin*; *Crast. Martin*; and the like. Others are probably kept in the Calendar for the sake of such tradesmen, handicraftsmen, and others as are wont to celebrate the memory of their tutelar saints; as the *Welchmen* do of *St. David*, the shoemakers of *St. Crispin*, &c. And again, churches being in several places dedicated to some or other of these Saints, it has been the usual custom in such places to have *wakes* or *fairs* kept upon those days; so that the people would probably be displeased if, either in this or the former case, their favourite Saint’s name should be left out of the Calendar. Besides, the histories which were writ before the Reformation do frequently speak of transactions happening upon such a holy-day, or about such a time, without mentioning the month; relating one thing to be done at *Lammas-tide*, and another about *Martinmas*, &c., so that were the names left out of the Calendar, we might be at a loss to know when several of these transactions happened.”—*Rat. Illus.*, p. 54. Lond., 1842.

They were retained, as Wheatly observes, for the convenience (1) of courts of justice which made their returns on these days; (2) of tradesmen who celebrated certain Saints; and also (3) to mark the proper times of Fairs; and (4) to enable readers to understand the reference in Histories to *Lammas-tide*, *Martinmas*, &c.

There is no ground whatever for the assumption that the Church of England regards them as minor festivals

1. The statement of the authorities in the above monition is most explicit.

2. There are no Services, special Epistles, Gospels or Collects, appointed for the above days.

3. They are excluded from “the table of *all* the feasts that are to be observed in the Church of England throughout the year.”

quarundam rerum, quarum stata tempora nosse plurimum refert, quarumque ignoratio nostris hominibus obesse possit, *quasi nota quædam sint atque indicia*. Atque hæc quidem hujus facti et instituti nostri ratio esto vale.—*Preces Privatae*, p. 428. P.S.

The Dean of Arches (Sir R. Phillimore) ruled in the Purchas case as follows :—

“ I think the holy days which are directed to be observed are those which are to be found after the Preface of the Prayer Book, under the head of ‘ a table of all the feasts that are to be observed by the Church of England throughout the year.’ The feasts of St. Leonard, St. Martin and St. Britius are not among these; I therefore think the notices of them were improper, and I must admonish Mr. Purchas to abstain from giving such notices in the future.”

Pagan Festivals were noted in early Christian calendars (see p. 40) for public convenience, not for observance.

Anglican Principles.—Thus the Church of England, in her commemoration only of scriptural Saints, abstains from infringing upon the prerogative of the Most High, who “ knoweth them that are his” (2 Tim. ii. 19). Bellarmine quotes Sulpitius, who states “ that the common people did long celebrate one for a martyr who afterwards appeared, and told them that he was damned” (“ De Sanct. Beat.,” Lib. i, c. 7). The Church of Rome in the 10th century, attempted to provide against mistakes by a process of canonization, but in so doing she presumes to occupy the judgment throne: “ Thou (Lord) even thou only, knowest the hearts of all the children of men.”—1 Kings viii. 39.

The following Table in the Calendar regulates the **Movable Feasts and Holy days** :—

“ EASTER DAY, on which the rest depend, is always the first Sunday after the full Moon, which happens upon, or next after, the 21st day of March; and if the full moon happens upon a Sunday, Easter Day is the Sunday after.

“ *Advent Sunday* is always the nearest *Sunday* to the *Feast of St. Andrew*, whether before or after.”

Septuagesima Sunday is 9 weeks before Easter.

Sexagesima	„	8	„	„
Quinquagesima	„	7	„	„
Quadragesima	„	6	„	„

Rogation Sunday	is	5 weeks	after Easter.
Ascension Day	„	40 days	„ „
Whit Sunday	„	7 weeks	„ „
Trinity Sunday	„	8 weeks	„ „

Advent (*Adventus, coming*).—This season which commemorates the first coming of Christ “in great humility,” and points to His second coming in “His Glorious Majesty,” is preparative for *Christmas*, the festival of Christ’s incarnation. The observance of Advent is traceable to the 6th century.

• **Easter**, from Eostre, spring; also called Pasch—the original title—is derivable from Apostolic times. A controversy arose as to the proper day of its observance. *See p. 40.*

Septuagesima, **Sexagesima**, **Quinquagesima** and **Quadragesima**, denote in round numbers, 70, 60, 50, and 40 days before Easter. *Quadragesima*, is not distinguished by special Collect, Epistle and Gospel. It denoted anciently the first Sunday in Lent.

Rogation Sunday likewise is not distinguished. It is so-called in relation to the Rogation days.—*See p. 59.*

Ascension.—This has been celebrated from the earliest times. Riddle attributes it to the latter half of the 3rd century. Augustine thinks that it may have had Apostolic origin.—*Bingham, Antiq.*, p. 321, vol. ii.

Whit-Sunday is also of great antiquity (*Acts ii.*). Augustine associates it with the feast of Easter and Ascension. The word *Whit* is probably derived from the *white* robes worn by those who were baptized on Whit-Sunday, or from the word *wit* signifying the wisdom which was imparted by the gift of the Holy Ghost.

Pfingsten

Trinity Sunday is one of the latest of the festivals; it was not generally observed till the fourteenth century.

The “Table of all the Feasts” is given at p. 48. We now refer to them IN THE ORDER in which they occur in the PRAYER BOOK, BEGINNING AFTER ADVENT.

Ascension Day, being a movable Feast, is referred to above.

Sunday, or the Christian Sabbath, stands at the head of the list. The institution of a day of rest immediately succeeded the creation (Gen. ii. 3). The Mosaic law re-asserted its authority (Exod. xx. 8, 9, 10). But the Jews observed it before this (Exod. xvi. 22-31). The Christian Church has taken the first day of the week as its Sabbath, and commemorates thereon the resurrection of the Lord Jesus as well as the creation. Thus see Acts xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 2; Rev. i. 10. The response to the Fourth Commandment recognizes the duty of Christians to "keep this law."*

St. Thomas, the Apostle, called Didymus or Twin, doubted the resurrection, and was convinced (John xx. 24). Vasco de Gama, A.D. 1500, met a Christian community claiming to have received their Christianity from this Apostle. Dr. Buchanan in his researches in 1806 visited them, and describes their doctrines and practices. They were never subject to the Bishop of Rome. *See his "Christian Researches."*

Christmas.—Riddle remarks that the establishment of this festival took place in the fourth century. Its propriety cannot be questioned. In the Eastern Church anciently it was kept on the 6th of January, now observed as Epiphany. The word Christmas means feast of Christ; mas, derived from Anglo-Saxon, signifies a festival.

St. Stephen, Deacon and Martyr (Acts vi. vii.). This feast, as that of the *first* Martyr, naturally follows

* For a considerable period the Jewish Sabbath was observed as well as the first day of the week, although it can be shown from Tertullian, Irenæus, Justin Martyr, and Eusebius, that it was regarded as a mere *temporary* institution. Dr. Cave gives the reason as follows:—"For the Jews being generally the first converts to the Christian faith, they still retained a mighty reverence for the Mosaic institutions, and especially for the Sabbath. . . . For this reason it seemed good to the prudence of those times (as in other of the Jewish rites, so in this) to indulge the humours of the people, and to keep the Sabbath as a day for religious offices, viz., public prayers, reading of the Scriptures, preaching, celebration of the sacraments, and such like duties."—*Prim. Christ.*, chap. vii, lib. 1.

Christmas Day. It is mentioned in the "Apostolical Constitutions," which were probably written in the 4th century.—Lib. viii, c. 3.

St. John the Evangelist.—This festival of the beloved disciple appropriately follows that of the first Martyr. John survived all the disciples. L'Estrange remarks that "though there is no clear and express mention of this festival in olden times," yet there is reason to believe that it was observed with other apostolic commemorations.—*Alliance of Offices*.

The Innocents' Day.—This feast, traceable to the third century, commemorates the massacre of the Innocents.—*Matt. ii.*

The Circumcision, originally called "the Octave of Christmas," occurs on the eighth day after the Nativity (Luke ii. 21). Wheatly remarks that it is not of very great antiquity.

Epiphany, or Manifestation.—This feast refers to Christ's manifestation to the Magi (Matt. ii. 1), and at His baptism (Luke iii. 21), and in His miracle in Cana of Galilee (John ii. 1). The Gospel of the day, with the Collect, refers to the first event; the Second Lesson in the morning to the second event; and the Second Lesson in the evening to the third. This festival was generally observed in the fourth century: it claims even an earlier date. The Sundays after Epiphany vary in number, being regulated by Easter.

The Conversion of St. Paul (Acts ix.). This feast is not so ancient as that of St. Peter and St. Paul, which is not observed by the Church of England probably on account of popular misconceptions.

"The Presentation of Christ in the Temple, commonly called the Purification of Saint Mary the Virgin," although it has some relation to the Virgin Mary, belongs more particularly to the Lord Jesus. This is indicated in its opening title. On the occasion of the Purification, Simeon declared that Christ was "a light to lighten the Gentiles." This feast is traceable to the seventh century. It has been called Candlemas from

the superstitious practice which sprung up of carrying lights in procession on this day—a practice which was abolished by the Reformers.

St. Matthias, whose festival next occurs, was Apostle in room of Judas. We read of him only in connection with his election to the Apostolate (Acts i. 26). Traditions regarding him are uncertain.

The Annunciation of Mary (Luke i. 26), like the feast of the Presentation or Purification, relates mainly to the Lord Jesus. Its rise is attributed to the seventh century.

St. Mark, whose commemoration occurs next, was the son of Mary, to whose house Peter went after his release from prison (Acts xii. 12). Mention is made of him in Acts xii. 25; xiii. 13; xv. 39; Colos. iv. 10; 2 Tim. iv. 11; 1 Peter v. 13. He is described as “John whose surname was Mark” (Acts xii. 12). It is stated by early writers that he wrote the Gospel under the direction of St. Peter.

St. Philip and St. James.—Philip’s call is recorded in John i. 43. He is associated with Bartholomew in the list of Apostles (Matt. x. 3). James, “the son of Alpheus” (Luke, vi. 15) is by some identified with “the Lord’s brother” (Gal. i. 19), but the evidence is not sufficient. It is not known why the two Apostles are joined in one festival.

Saint Barnabas the Apostle.—Joses, or Joseph, was surnamed Barnabas, which means “son of consolation.” He was a Levite of Cyprus. He laid all at the Apostles’ feet (Acts iv. 36, 37). He accompanied Paul in many of his missionary tours (Acts xi. 30; xiii., xiv., xv.). This festival was established in the twelfth century.

Saint John Baptist’s Day was observed in the fourth century. This festival points mainly to his nativity.—*Luke i. 36.*

St. Peter’s Day.—This festival, existing in the fourth century, combined the celebration of St. Paul’s martyrdom with that of Peter, as the festival of St. Peter

and St. Paul. But the Reformers separated the commemorations.—*See infra.*

St. James the Apostle.—This festival was celebrated at an early date, but was not generally observed till the eleventh century. This Apostle is described as “the son of Zebedee.” His call with that of “John his brother” is recorded in Matt. iv. 21, and his martyrdom in Acts xii. 2. Thus he drank of “the Cup” mentioned in Matt. xx. 23.

St. Bartholomew the Apostle is identified with Nathaniel because his name is associated with that of Philip in the Apostolic list. The festival is by some traced to the eleventh century; by others to the eighth.

St. Matthew the Apostle.—The origin of this festival is uncertain; it does not appear to have been generally observed till the eleventh century. His call is recorded in Matt. ix. 9, where he is named Matthew, and in Mark ii. 14, named “Levi, the son of Alpheus.” He was a Publican, or tax-gatherer. The grace of Christ was magnified in the appointment of Matthew, a Publican, on the one hand, and Saul of Tarsus, a Pharisee, on the other, to the Apostolate.

St. Michael and All Angels'.—This festival is a recognition of the truth that the angels minister by Divine appointment to the heirs of salvation (Heb. i. 14). Our Collect refers to their ministration on *earth*, while the Roman Collect refers to their *intercession* in heaven. The Roman Collect is as follows:—

“We offer thee, O Lord, this sacrifice of praise: that *by the intercession of Thy Angels*, Thou wouldest mercifully receive the same, and grant that it may avail us unto salvation. Through.”

St. Luke the Evangelist.—“The beloved Physician” was associated with St. Paul in many of his journeys. In Acts xvi. 11, he, as author of the book, associates himself with Paul, speaking in the first person plural. *See* Acts xx., xxi., and elsewhere.

There is a marked contrast between our Collect and the Roman in which prayer is offered that Luke may “intercede for us.”

St. Simon and St. Jude.—The two Apostles are associated in the lists of the Apostles. “Labbeus whose surname was Thaddeus: Simon the Cananite” (Matt. x. 3, 4). “Thaddeus and Simon the Cananite” (Mark iii. 18). “Simon called Zelotes and Judas” (Luke vi. 15, 16). Thaddeus is a form of the word Judas or Jude. ~~Simon was probably a native of Cana, and is therefore called the Cananite, not Canaanite.~~ He is also called Zelotes, meaning that he had been of the sect of the Zealots. = *Cana an.*

All Saints' Day.—This festival is traceable to the 7th century. Wheatly truly remarks:—

“Our reformers having laid aside the celebration of a great many martyrs' days, which had grown too numerous and cumbersome to the Church, thought fit to retain this day, whereon the Church by a general commemoration returns her thanks for them all.”—*In loco.*

St. Andrew's Day.—This Apostle's commemoration stands at the head of the holidays. Andrew, who had been a disciple of John the Baptist, was the first of the disciples who followed the Lord Jesus. He then brought Simon, his brother, to the Messiah.”—*John i. 40.*

“A Table of the Vigils, Fasts, and days of Abstinence, to be observed in the year:—

The Evens or Vigils before The Nativity of our Lord.

”	”	”	The Purification of the Blessed Virgin <i>Mary.</i>
”	”	”	The Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin.
”	”	”	Easter Day.
”	”	”	Ascension Day.
”	”	”	Pentecost.
”	”	”	<i>St. Matthias.</i>
”	”	”	<i>St. John Baptist.</i>
”	”	”	<i>St. Peter.</i>
”	”	”	<i>St. James.</i>
”	”	”	<i>St. Bartholomew.</i>
”	”	”	<i>St. Matthew.</i>
”	”	”	<i>St. Simon and St. Jude.</i>
”	”	”	<i>St. Andrew.</i>
”	”	”	<i>St. Thomas.</i>
”	”	”	All Saints.

Note.—That if any of these Feast Days fall upon a *Monday*, then the Vigil or Fast Day shall be kept upon the *Saturday*, and not upon the *Sunday* next before it.”—*The Calendar.*

Vigils.—In early days of persecution, when Christianity was interdicted, believers were compelled to worship

secretly, and at night. Subsequently, it became customary to make preparation for solemnities, and festivals, by night watches, or *Vigils*. But abuses crept in, and led to the abolition of the practice.

Cranmer remarks, that “Vigils, otherwise called Watchings, remained in the *Calendar*, upon certain Saints’ Evens because, in old times, the people watched all those nights,” and he adds: “but now these many years those Vigils remained in the books, *for no man did watch.*”—*Works*, vol. ii, p. 175. P.S.

The word Vigil is now applied to the day preceding the Festival. The Prayer Book supplies “a table of the Vigils, Fasts, and Days of Abstinence to be observed in the year.” The Holy days which occur between the festivals of Christmas, and the Purification, and between Easter and Whitsuntide, being seasons of joy, generally have no Vigils, or Fasts, attached to them.

The feast of the *Ascension*, occurring within the latter season, is an exception, while the feast of St. Michael and All Angels, occurring in September, and the festival of St. Luke in October, have no Vigils.

The reasons for the exceptions are not positively unknown. As to *Ascension*, Wheatly says it may be well to inquire, “whether there was any Vigil prefixed to it before the institution of the Rogation fasts, which were appointed upon the three days that precede this festival.”—*In loco, as before.*

As to the feast of *St. Michael and All Angels*, he says that there is no Vigil attached to it because “those ministering Spirits, for whose protection and assistance we return thanks on that day, were at first created in the full possession of bliss;” whereas the *Saints* whom we commemorate “passed through sufferings.” As to the feast of *St. Luke*, he remarks that it has no Vigil, because the “eve of that Saint was formerly, itself, a celebrated Holy day in the Church of England—viz., The feast of *St. Etheldreda*.”

Bishop Barry thinks, that “the omission of the Vigil to *St. Luke’s Day*, is probably accidental in consequence

of the occurrence on the day preceding of the well-known feast of St. Etheldreda."

These opinions are merely conjectural.

"DAYS OF FASTING OR ABSTINENCE.

- I. The Forty days of Lent.
- II. The Ember days at the Four Seasons being the *Wednesday, Friday and Saturday* after *the First Sunday in Lent.* 1. The First *Sunday in Lent.*
2. The Feast of *Pentecost.*
3. *September 14.*
4. *December 13.*
- III. The Three *Rogation Days*, being the *Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday* before *Holy Thursday*, or the *Ascension* of our *Lord.*
- IV. All the *Fridays* in the year, except *CHRISTMAS DAY.*"

Lent, of which Ash-Wednesday is the first day, in its Saxon derivation, denotes spring. Bingham remarks upon the probabilities that "at first it was only a fast of forty hours" ("Antiq.," Book xxi, c. 1). According to the same authority, it was not extended to forty days until the time of Gregory the Great.

Ash-Wednesday's fast was instituted in the sixth century. It was called the *caput jejunii*, the head of the fast.

Good Friday was originally observed as a part of the Easter season. Riddle observes that its separate observance is traceable to the second century.—*Antiq.*, p. 633, vol. ii.

The Ember Days occur as above. It is supposed that the word *Ember* is derived from quatember, a corruption of *quatuor tempora*, the four seasons: the opinion that it has reference to the sprinkling of ashes is groundless. The 31st Canon directs that ordinations shall take place thereon.—*Acts* xiii. 3.

Rogation Days.—The institution of Rogation Days has been attributed to Mamertus, Bishop of Vienne in the 5th century. They were appointed as times of special supplication (*rogo*, to ask or entreat) on account of national calamities.—See chap. xiv, at the end.

Days of Fasting or Abstinence.—The table specifies certain seasons and days. Wheately judiciously observes :—

“I do not find that the Church of England makes *any difference* between days of fasting and days of abstinence; it is true in the title of the table of vigils, &c., she mentions fasts and days of abstinence separately; but when she comes to enumerate particulars, *she calls them all days of fasting or abstinence*, without distinguishing between the one and the other. Nor does she anywhere point out to us what food is proper for such times or seasons, or seem to place any part of religion in abstaining from any particular kinds of meat.”—*Rational Illus.*, p. 195.

The following points are clear :—

1. The Church of England makes no distinction of meats. The Statute 2 and 3 Edward VI, prohibited flesh on fast days for “the encouragement of fishing and navigation.” Latimer observes: “And this law is but a matter of policy, not of religion or holiness.”—*Remains*, p. 81. P.S.

King Edward VI in his proclamation, January 16th, 1548, expressly declared that “all meats be of one and equal purity,” and added that he retained the fasting days “both that men should on these days abstain and forbear their pleasures to subdue their bodies unto the soul and spirit,” and also “to spare flesh and use fish for the benefit of the Commonwealth.”—*Cranmer’s Remains and Letters*, p. 508. P.S.

2. The Church rejects the notion of merit in fasting. The Homily on Fasting guards against this very error, as follows :—

“Of this sort of works is fasting, which of itself is a thing merely indifferent: but it is made better or worse by the end that it serveth unto. For when it respecteth a good end, it is a good work; but the end being evil, the work itself also is evil. To fast then with this persuasion of mind, that our fasting and good works can make us good, perfect and just men, and finally bring us to heaven, this is a devilish persuasion; and that fast is so far off from pleasing of God that it refuseth His mercy, and is altogether derogatory to the merits of Christ’s death, and His precious blood-shedding.”

The object of fasting according to the Homily is (1) to tame the flesh, (2) that the spirit may be more

earnest in prayer, and (3) as a witness of our humble submission to God.

The Church of England has appointed seasons of fasting for those who find it to be profitable, but she does not enjoin it, or specify its mode. Her members are free to act according to the dictates of conscience, and their own judgment.

No Protestant community objects to the true principle of fasting. The Church of Scotland (Established) recognizes it (see "Collections and Observations." Edinburgh, 1709). The *Directory* which was substituted for the Prayer Book in 1644, has a chapter concerning "*Solemn public fasting*."

The Primitive Christians as to Fasting.—The views of the Orthodox in the 2nd century as to fasting, appear from Tertullian's treatise on the subject. Tertullian became a Montanist, and seceded from the general body of Christians, or Catholics, as they were called. He took up very strong views on the subject of fasting, and denounced his opponents, the orthodox, as Psychics, or Carnal. He says, "Meanwhile, they hurl in our teeth the fact that Isaiah withal has declared authoritatively, 'Not such a fast hath the Lord elected,' that is, not abstinence from food, but the works of righteousness hath he there approved" (Isaiah lviii. 3-7). He describes them also as quoting the words of the Apostle to the Galatians, "ye observe days and months and years" (Gal. iv. 10), and the words of Christ, "not such things as enter in the mouth defile the man" (Matt. xv. 11). It appears from the treatise that the orthodox did not object to fasting when rightly viewed, but to its *imposition as a necessity*. Tertullian censures them because they held that fasting "was to be done of choice, not of command."—*Op.*, p. 544. Paris, 1663.

Unhappily, the extreme views of Tertullian and the Montanist heretics, on the subject of fasting, were at length adopted by many of the orthodox in the third and succeeding centuries.

The Church of Rome enforces a rigid system of fasting

contrary to the true Catholic principle of the orthodox in the 2nd century, that fasting "is to be done of *choice*, not of command" (see above). Her system is explained in **Bishop Doyle's Catechism**, as follows:—

"Q. What do you mean by fast days?

A. Certain days on which we are allowed but one meal, with a small refreshment either in the morning or evening, and *forbidden* flesh meat.

"Q. What do you mean by days of abstinence?

A. Certain days on which we are *forbidden* to eat flesh meat, but are allowed the usual number of meals."

Having explained that the sick, and weak, and persons not fully grown, are not obliged to fast, the Catechism proceeds:—

"Q. *Is it strictly forbidden by the Church to eat flesh meat on Saturday as on Friday?*

A. Yes; and to eat flesh meat on Saturday, or any other day on which *it is forbidden*, without necessity and leave from the Church, is *very sinful*."—*The General Catechism*. Dublin, 1843.

"*A Catechism of Christian Doctrine for the use of the faithful*," sanctioned by Dr. Wiseman, puts the following question and answer:—

"Q. Why does the Church *command* us to fast and abstain?

A. That we may mortify the flesh, and *satisfy God for our sins*."—P. 31. London.

It is remarkable that the Apostle gives "commanding to fast" as a mark of the Apostasy.—See 1 Tim. iv. 3.

CHAPTER XII.

SECTION I.

ORNAMENTS OF THE CHURCH.

(See "Rubric on Ornaments," p. 77.)

THE Judges in the Liddell case remark that "the term ORNAMENTS in ecclesiastical law is not confined, as by modern usage, to articles of decoration, or embellishment, but is used in the larger sense of the word *ornamentum*," as denoting "all the several articles used in the performance of the services and rites of the Church," such as "vestments, books, clothes, chalices, and patens." They ruled that the word "Ornaments" does not apply in the rubric to mere decorations. We now refer to some points as settled.

The Cross.—The Court of Appeal in *Liddell v. Westerton* ruled as follows:—

"But although their Lordships are of opinion that the law did not require the removal from churches of crosses merely as such, *both Books of Common Prayer have excluded them from use in the service. They were no longer to be employed.*"

The cross, therefore, as an *instrumentum* is unlawful in the service.

Further, it is not lawful to place the cross on the Communion table. The Judges have ruled as follows:

"Next, with respect to the wooden cross attached to the Communion table at St. Paul's. Their Lordships have already declared their opinion that the Communion table intended by the Canon was a table in the ordinary sense of the word, flat and movable, capable of being covered with a cloth, at which, or *around which*, the Communicants might be placed in order to partake of the Lord's Supper: and the question is, whether the existence of a cross attached to the table, is consistent either with the Spirit, or with the letter of those regulations. Their Lordships are clearly of opinion that it is not, and they must recommend that upon this point also the decree complained of should be affirmed."

As an *architectural* decoration, however, it may be allowed:—

“Their Lordships hope and believe that the laws in force respecting the consecration of any building for a Church, and which *forbid any subsequent alteration without a faculty* from the Ordinary, will be sufficient to prevent any abuse in this respect.”

Lights on the Communion Table.—The Court of Appeal, in *Martin v. Mackonochie*, ruled that lighted candles are not within the words of the rubric, and are therefore illegal in daylight. The Judges give their reasons as follow:—

“The lighted candles are clearly not ‘ornaments’ within the words of the rubric, for they are not prescribed by the authority of Parliament therein mentioned—namely, the first Prayer Book; nor is the injunction of 1547 the authority of Parliament within the meaning of the rubric. They are not subsidiary to the service, for they do not aid or facilitate—much less are they necessary to the service; nor can a separate and independent ornament previously in use be said to be consistent with a rubric which is silent as to it, and which by necessary implication abolishes what it does not retain. It was strongly pressed by the respondent’s counsel that the use of lighted candles up to the time of the issue of the first Prayer Book was clearly legal; that the lighted candles were in use in the Church in the second year of Edward VI, and that there was nothing in the Prayer Book of that year making it unlawful to continue them. All this may be conceded, but it is in reality beside the question. The rubric of our Prayer Book might have said, those ornaments shall be retained which are lawful, or which were in use in the second year of Edward VI, and the argument as to actual use at the time, and as to the weight of the injunction of 1547, might in that case have been material. But the rubric, speaking in 1661, more than 100 years subsequently, has, for reasons which it is not the province of a judicial tribunal to criticize, defined the class of ornaments to be retained, by a reference, not to what was in use *de facto*, or to what was lawful in 1549, but to what was in the Church by authority of Parliament in that year; and in the Parliamentary authority which this Committee has held, and which their Lordships hold, to be indicated by these words, the ornaments in question are not found to be included. Their Lordships have not referred to the usage as to lights during the last 300 years; but they are of opinion that the very general disuse of lights after the Reformation (whatever exceptional cases to the contrary might be produced), contrasted with their normal and prescribed use previously, affords a very strong contemporaneous and continuous exposition of the law upon the subject. Their Lordships will, therefore, humbly advise her Majesty that the charge as to lights also has been sustained, and that the respondent should be admonished for the future to abstain from the use of them as pleaded in these articles.”

On the subject of “candle lighting,” see the third part of the Homily “against peril of idolatry.”

Covering of the Communion Table.—Two points were decided by the Judgment in *Liddell v. Westerton*.

As to the covering of the table at *service time*, the Judges remark:—

“Whether the cloths so used are suitable, or not, is a matter to be left to the discretion of the Ordinary.”

As to the covering in *Communion time*, it was ruled:—

“The last question is, with respect to the embroidered linen and lace used on the Communion table, at the time of the ministration of the Holy Communion. The rubric and the canon prescribe the use of a fair white linen cloth, and both the learned Judges in the Court below have been of opinion that embroidery and lace are not consistent with the meaning of that expression, having regard to the nature of the table upon which the cloth is to be used. Although their Lordships are not disposed in any case to restrict within narrower limits than the law has imposed, the discretion which, within those limits, is justly allowed to congregations by the rules both of the Ecclesiastical and the Common Law Courts, the directions of the rubric must be complied with; and, upon the whole, their Lordships do not dissent from the construction of the rubric adopted by the present decree upon this point; and they must, therefore, advise Her Majesty to affirm it.”

It was ruled in the same case that the side table for the reception of the elements in St. Paul’s Church, Knightsbridge, is not contrary to the rubric. The Judges regarded it as *subsidiary* not to an *Altar*, but to the Table of Communion. The Judge of the Court of Arches had ordered its removal, but the Privy Council reversed the rule on the following grounds:—“It is simply a small table on which the bread and wine are placed before the consecration, having no connection with any superstitious usage of the Church of Rome. Their removal has been ordered on the ground that they are adjuncts to an Altar; their Lordships cannot but think that they are more properly to be regarded as adjuncts to the Communion Table.” The Judges proceed to show that the rubric requires that “the Minister shall place the bread and wine on the Communion Table,” “at a certain point in the course of

the Communion service"—that is, before the Prayer of Consecration.

Baxter's Prayer Book, which was approved by the Puritans, and presented at the Savoy for acceptance, contained the following rubric:—

"Here let the Bread be brought to the minister, and received by him and set upon the Table; and then the wine in like manner: or if they be set there before, however, let him bless them, praying in these or the like words:—

"Almighty God, thou art the Creator and the Lord of all things. . . . Sanctify these Thy creatures of bread and wine, which, according to Thy institution and command, we set apart to this holy use, that they may be sacramentally the body and blood of Thy Son Jesus Christ. Amen."

The location of the elements on the Communion Table by the minister, is thus suggested as the first alternative. The Puritans had also suggested the manual acts which were restored in the last review. They complained at the Savoy Conference, that "the manner of consecration of the elements is not here explicit and distinct enough, and the minister's breaking of the bread is not so much as mentioned."—*Cardwell's Conf.*, p. 321.

Under these circumstances, the rubrics were introduced in the last review requiring the minister to place the elements on the table, and to break the bread, and to perform other manual acts.

But it is well to note that while the law allows, it does *not require* a side table of which nothing is said in either canon or rubric. The elements may be brought to the minister at the same time as the alms, and by him laid on the Table.

Decoration of Churches.—The Church of England discourages excessive decoration. She has given a Homily in three parts "against PERIL OF IDOLATRY AND SUPERFLUOUS DECKING OF CHURCHES."

In the third part of that Homily, the Church shows that the primitive Christians had no gorgeously decorated churches, and observes that "*the world was won to Christendom not by gorgeous, gilded and painted temples of Christians which had scarcely houses to dwell in, but*

by the godly, and, as it were, *golden minds* and firm faith of such as in all adversity and persecution professed the truth of our religion." In reference to the decorations of the Old Testament dispensation, she says that, "all these things went before in *figure*." Those "outward things are suffered *for a time* until Christ our Lord came, who turned all those outward things into spirit, faith and truth."

The Reformers were not compromisers, and *the Reformation was not a compromise*. Grave apprehensions were entertained that Queen Elizabeth intended to restore images in churches. The Bishops, with Parker at their head, addressed a firm remonstrance to Her Majesty in which they besought her to "consider that God's word doth threaten a terrible judgment unto us, if we, being pastors and ministers in His Church, should assent unto the thing which, in our learning and conscience, we are persuaded doth tend to the confirmation of error, superstition, and *idolatry*; and finally, to the *ruin of souls* committed to our charge, for the which we must give an account to the Prince of Pastors in the last day." Their fidelity was rewarded with success: images were not restored.

The address which they presented to Her Majesty is given in full in "Parker's Correspondence," published by the Parker Society. We refer to a passage in which they cite the words of Epiphanius:—"I entered (the church) to pray, I found there a linen cloth hanging in the church door, *painted, and having in it the image of Christ* as it were, or of some other saint; (for I remember not well whose image it was:) therefore, when I did see the image of a man hanging in the Church of Christ, *contrary to the authority of the Scriptures*, I did tear it, and gave counsel to the keepers of the church that they should wind a poor man that was dead in the said cloth, and so bury him." Upon this, the Bishops remark in the following words:—

1. "First, that by the judgment of this ancient Father to permit images in churches is against the

authority of the Scriptures, meaning against the Second Commandment: Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image, &c.

2. "Secondly, that Epiphanius doth reject not only graven and molten, *but also painted images*; forasmuch as he cutteth in pieces the image painted in a vail, hanging at the church door, what would he have done *if he had found it over the Lord's Table?*

3 "Thirdly, that he spareth not the image of Christ, for no doubt that image is most perilous in the Church of all other.

4. "Fourthly, that he did not only remove it, but with a vehemence of zeal, cut it to pieces, following the example of good King Ezechias, who brake the brazen serpent and burnt it to ashes.

5. "Last of all, Epiphanius thinketh it the duty of vigilant Bishops to be careful that no such kind of painted image be permitted in the Church."—P. 89.

Similar observations occur in the Homily above referred to.

SECTION II.

ORNAMENTS OF THE MINISTER.

Primitive Usage.—The Church of England, in the third part of her Homily "against peril of idolatry," remarks:—"Likewise were the vestures used in the Church in old time, *very plain and single, and nothing costly*. And Rabanus at large declarereth that *this costly and manifold furniture of vestments of late used in the Church* was fet (brought) from the *Jewish usage*, and agreeeth with Aaron's apparelling altogether."

Marriott, in his elaborate work, "Vestiarium Christianum," gives a history, with illustrations, of "the origin and gradual development of ecclesiastical dress." He divides the past into three periods, (1) the first four

centuries, (2) from the year 400 to 800, and (3) from the year 800 to the present time. He shows that “of all the various types of ministering dress, now retained in different branches of the Church, there is one, and one only, which approaches closely both in form and distinctive ornament to that of primitive Christendom,” namely, the *Surplice with Scarf* (p. lxxxii. Rivingtons, London, 1868). He gives numerous plates and descriptions of that ancient dress. He shows further that “*the development of sacerdotal dress was exactly coincident in time with the development of innovations in Eucharistic doctrines.*”—P. lxxxii.

Mediæval Usage.—Carter, in his “Notes on the Sarum Office,” gives the following account of the vestments which it appointed:—“The Priest first put on the *Amice*, a square piece of linen, which fastened round the neck like a collar or handkerchief; then he put on the *Alb*, a long flowing garment of white linen, with *tight* sleeves; then the *Stole* of the colour of the day; this he crossed over his breast, and secured both it and the *Alb* by a linen girdle; after this, the *Fanon* or *Maniple*, in shape exactly like the stole, but, of course, much shorter, over his right arm; lastly, he put on the principal vestment, or *Chasuble*, a large oval cloak, reaching in front to about the knees, and about six or eight inches longer behind, and narrowed off at the side to about halfway between the elbow and wrist. It was made of various stuffs (never of linen), and followed like the stole the colour of the day.—*The Liturgy of the Church of Sarum*, p. 36. London, 1866.

Dr. Rock, in his “*Hierurgia*,” states that the *Chasuble* is “the habit peculiar to his order” (that of Priest) when about to *offer up the Eucharistic Sacrifice* (p. 439). Neither the *Surplice* nor *Cope* was regarded as a sacrificial vestment. Dr. Rock describes “the *Surplice* as the *choral*” robe (p. 7, vol. ii) and the *Cope* as “pre-eminently” the “*processional*” (p. 44, vol. ii). Such was the law regarding the vestments prior to the Reformation.

The Usage of 1549.—The Reformers in the first Reformed Prayer Book rejected several of the above vestments, and appointed the “Vestment (Chasuble) or Cope,” as the vesture of the celebrant. This permission to use the *Cope*, a *processional* robe, instead of the *Chasuble*, which was regarded as *sacrificial*, was a direct breach of mediæval law. We now supply the rubrics of the book of 1549 :—

“ Upon the day, and at the time appointed for the ministration of the Holy Communion, the Priest that shall execute the holy ministry, shall put upon him the vesture appointed for that ministration, that is to say: a white Albe plain, with a vestment or Cope. And where there be many Priests or Deacons, there so many shall be ready to help the Priest, in the ministration, as shall be requisite: And shall have upon them likewise the vestures appointed for their ministry, that is to say, Albes with tunicles. Then shall the Clerks sing in English for the office, or Introit (as they call it), a Psalm appointed for that day.”

“ In the saying or singing of Matins and Evensong, Baptizing and Burying, the minister, in parish churches and chapels annexed to the same, shall use a Surplice. And in all Cathedral Churches and Colleges, the Archdeacons, Deans, Provosts, Masters, Prebendaries, and Fellows, being graduates, may use in the quire, beside their Surplices, such hood as pertaineth to their several degrees, which they have taken in any university within this realm. But in all other places every minister shall be at liberty to use any surplice or no. It is also seemly that graduates, when they do preach, shall use such hoods as pertaineth to their several degrees.

“ And whosoever the Bishop shall celebrate the Holy Communion in the Church, or execute any other public ministration, he shall have upon him, beside his rochette, a Surplice or albe, and a cope or vestment, and also his pastoral staff in his hand, or else borne or holden by his chaplain.”

Here the Cope is allowed *instead* of the Chasuble, and there is no mention whatever of the *Amice*, *Stole*, *Fanon*, or *Maniple*. On this ground, Sir Robert Phillimore ruled that the *Stole** is illegal. The permission to put aside the Chasuble, and the entire removal of the *Stole*, do not consist with the Roman Ordinal which recognizes both as the proper vestments of the sacrificing Priest. The Romish Bishop in ordination, puts the *Casula* (chasuble) on the candidate for Priest’s orders, and says :—

* The Scarf is not properly a *Stole*.

“*Accipe vestem sacerdotalem,*” receive the sacerdotal vestment. Morinus, a Romish expert, admits that he could not find this form in any Ritual for nine hundred years after Christ.

The Usage of 1552.—The Reformers in the Prayer Book of 1552 rejected the Chasuble, and even the Cope in the following rubric :—

“And here is to be noted, that the Minister at the time of the communion, and at all other times in his ministration, shall use neither Alb, Vestment nor Cope; but being Archbishop or Bishop, he shall have and wear a rochet; and being a Priest or Deacon, he shall have and wear a surplice only.”

The views of the Reformed had become very decided. Ridley, after the accession of Queen Mary, in his “*Piteous Lamentation,*” said :—

“Thou must be a contributor to the charges of all the *disguised apparel* that the Popish sacrificing priest, like unto Aaron, must *play his part in.*”—*Works*, p. 67. P.S.

It is recorded that at his martyrdom,

“Dr. Ridley did vehemently inveigh against the Romish Bishop and all that foolish apparel, calling him Antichrist, and *the apparel foolish and abominable, yea, too fond for a vice in a play.*”—*Ibid.*, p. 289.

The Usage in the Reign of Elizabeth.—The Prayer Book of 1552 was adopted, but the question of vestments was reserved for further consideration. This reservation did not result from any hesitation on the part of the Reformers. Guest, one of the leading Commissioners, in reply to Cecil, says :—

“Of vestments. Because it is thought sufficient to use but a surplice in baptizing, reading, preaching, and praying, therefore it is enough also for the celebrating of the Communion.—*Cardwell's Conf.*, p. 50.

It appears that the Queen and her political advisers were at first undecided on the subject, and preferred to wait. The Act of Uniformity, therefore, contained a proviso (see p. 32), which placed the matter in the hands of the Queen, who, however, was bound to obtain the consent of the Metropolitan, or the Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

The second book of King Edward VI was attached to the Act of Uniformity in 1559. *If there had been no special provision in the Act, the Ornaments' Rubric of 1552 would have stood with the rest of the book, but the proviso already quoted (p. 32) made a provisional arrangement "until other order shall be therein taken."*

The Judges remark :—

"In this manner, and not by any textual alteration of the Rubrics in the second book of King Edward, the directions as to the ornaments of the first book were kept in force until other order should be therein taken in the way provided by the Act."

It appears, therefore, that the ornaments of the Church and Minister, until 1662, were regulated by the Act of Uniformity of 1559, and that the Rubric on Ornaments which appeared in the Prayer Books of 1559 and 1604, and remained till 1662, was but a note of reference to the Act.—See p. 37.

The vestments in use in the second year of Edward VI, were those appointed by the book of 1549. They were seven in number: the Chasuble, Alb, Tunicle, Cope, Surplice, Hood, and Rochette. If the Queen did not take other order, Chasuble, Alb, and Tunicle would now be legal garments. But Her Majesty, in pursuance of the Act, took "other order" by the advertisements of 1565-6, which were published by the Bishops *on her authority*, and which made the following provisions :—

"Item. In the ministrations of the Holy Communion in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, the principal minister shall use a cope with gospeller and epistoler agreeably; and at all other prayers to be said at that Communion table, to use no copes but surplices.

"Item. That the Dean and Prebendaries wear a surplice with a silk hood in the quire; and when they preach in the Cathedral or Collegiate Church to wear their hood.

"Item. That every minister saying any public prayers, or ministering the sacraments, or other rites of the Church, shall wear a comely surplice with sleeves, to be provided at the charges of the parish."—*Sparrow's Collections.*

This was emphatically an “*other order*.” The book of 1549 had appointed vestments (Chasuble or Cope) for the use of the Celebrant. The advertisements appointed the surplice, which, according to the book of 1549, was not a Eucharistic garment at all. The advertisements assigned the Cope to Cathedral and Collegiate Churches. Accordingly, Chasubles, Albs, and all vestments which were not prescribed were regarded as illegal. Synod and Bishop prohibited their use.

Some delay had occurred in the issue of the advertisements. The first draft contained doctrinal articles which had not received the approval of the Crown. The draft had been forwarded to Cecil by Parker on the 8th of March, 1564-5 (see “*Parker’s Correspondence*,” p. 234. P.S.). On the 28th of March 1566, Parker writes : “*I am now fully bent to prosecute this order, and to delay no longer, and I have weeded out of these articles all such of doctrine, &c., which peradventure stayed the book from the Queen Majesty’s approbation, and have put in but things avouchable, and, as I take them, against no law of the realm*” (p. 272, *ibid*). This at once discloses the cause of the delay. The result shows that the approval of the Crown, which had been withheld, was now given.* The Archbishop took steps to enforce the advertisements, and was followed by all the prelates in the kingdom. The delay which had occurred, from the causes indicated above, only served to prove that the Metropolitan and Bishops would not venture to act without supreme authority. They imposed the advertisements with energy, and deprived several clergymen who refused to conform. *If the Queen had not authorized the advertisements, the Bishops could have been indicted for breach of law.* Here we

* Before this, Cecil had written on the draft of the advertisements these words, “*these not authorized or published*,” but they were now sent forth *and published*. An unfair use has been made of Cecil’s words, as though they referred to the advertisements in their final and published form !

quote the words of the judgment in the Ridsdale case :— “The Queen had in the most formal manner, by her Royal letters, commanded the Metropolitan and other prelates to prepare these advertisements, directing them ‘so to proceed by order, injunction, or censure, according to the order and appointment of such *laws and ordinances as were provided by Parliament*, and the true meaning thereof, so as **UNIFORMITY** of order might be kept in every Church, and **WITHOUT VARIETY** or contention.’ There was no particular form required by statute or by law in which the Queen was to take order, and it was competent for her Majesty to do so by means of a Royal letter addressed to the Metropolitan. The advertisements were issued by the prelates as orders prepared under the Queen’s authority. Immediately after their issue, on the 21st May, 1566, Grindal, Bishop of London, writes to the Dean of St. Paul’s requiring him to put them in force, and stating that they were issued by the Queen’s authority, and that he, Grindal, would proceed to deprive any who should disobey them.” We now supply this important document to which the Judges refer :—

“AFTER my hartie comendacyons these are to require and to give you in especyall charge that wth all convenient speed you call before you all & singuler the mynisters and Eccliaistical psons wthin yor deanry of Poules and office, and to pscribe & enjoyn everie of them upon payne of deprivacon to prepare forthwth and to weare such habit and apparell as is ordeyned by the Queenes majesties authoritie expressed in the treatie intituled the advertisement, &c. which I send heerein enclosed unto you and in like to enjoyn everie of them under the said payne of deprivacon as well to observe the order of mynistracon in the Church with surples, and in such forme as is sett forth in the saide treatie, as alsoe to require the subscription of every of them to the said Advertisemts. And yf you shall pceive any of them to be disobedient, wch shall refuse to conforme themselves heerein, that then wthout any delay you certifie me the names of all such before Trynitie Sundaie next ensuinge to the intent I maie pceed to the reformacon and deprivacon of everie of them as appertayneth in this case with a Certificate alsoe of the names of such as pmiseth

conformatie. And thus I bid you farewell from my howse in London, this xxith of Maie, 1566."

Yor in Christ,

Indorssed

EDM. LONDON.

To the right-worshippfull the DEANE & CHAPTER OF POWLES.

Yeve theise.

—MS. from Dom. Eliz., Vol. 39, No. 36.

Convocation in 1571 decreed as follows:—

"No dean, nor archdeacon, nor residentiary, nor master, nor warden, nor head of any College or Cathedral Church, neither president nor rector, nor any of that order, by what name soever they be called, shall hereafter wear *the grey amice, or any other garment which hath been defiled with the like superstition*, but every one of them in his own church shall wear only that *linen* garment which is as yet retained *by the Queen's commandment*, and also his scholar's hood, according to every man's calling and degree in school."—*Sparrow's Collect*, p. 227.

The Queen's commandment was given in the advertisements, referred to by Convocation.

The 58th Canon followed the advertisements, and is expressed in much the same terms, as it *appears* from the following parallel:—

Advertisements.

"Every Minister saying any public prayers, or ministering the sacraments or other rites of the Church, shall wear a comely surplice with sleeves, to be provided at the charges of the Parish."

Canon 58.

"Every Minister saying the Public Prayers or ministering the Sacraments or other rites of the Church shall wear a decent and comely surplice with sleeves, to be provided at the charge of the Parish."

The 24th Canon of 1604 expressly refers to the advertisements.—See Sir E. Beckett's remarks on this point, p. 79.

The following additional authorities are referred to in proof that Sacrificial Vestments were not sanctioned by the Church of England:—

PARKER, 1566-7, Correspondence, p. 296. Parker Society.

WHITGIFT, Works, Vol. III, p. 550. P.S.

JEWEL, Defence of the Apology. Vol. III, pp. 176, 177.

BULLINGER, 1566, Zurich Letters, 1st Series, p. 345. P.S.

THE HEADS OF HOUSES IN CAMBRIDGE, 1572, Strype's Parker. Vol. I, p. 399. Oxford, 1821.

T. SHARPE. A Brotherly Persuasion to Unity. London, 1607.*

BISHOP HALL. Answer to the Brownists, p. 110. 1610.

* See p. 34.

The following authorities prove that the advertisements were recognized as a due ordering by the Queen, and that the action taken in reference to the vestments was according to the laws :—

GRINDAL to Zanchius, 1571, Remains, p. 339. P.S.

ABEL to Bullinger (London, June 6, 1566). Zurich Letters, 2nd Series, p. 119. P.S.

WITHERS and Barthelott (Aug. 1567). Zurich Letters, 2nd Series, p. 148. P.S.

HUMPHREY to Bullinger (July, 1566). Zurich Letters, 1st Series, p. 160. P.S.

GRINDAL to Bullinger (February 6, 1567). Zurich Letters, 1st Series, p. 176. P.S.

HOOKER. Keble's Edition, p. 587, Vol. III, 1845, with remarks in Ridsdale judgment.

HAMON L'ESTRANGE, Alliance of Offices, Ornaments' Rubric. Published in 1659.

SPARROW (One of the Savoy Commissioners), Rationale of the Book of Common Prayer. Ornaments' Rubric.

Many other authorities might be given.

Some have endeavoured to evade the force of the advertisement by the remark, that while they prescribe the surplice, they do not forbid the Mediæval vestments as worn *over* the Surplice ! But there are several points which are fatal to this evasion.

1. The direction relates to a visible or super vesture, not to an *inside* garb. If there be no definite regulation on the point, the Puritan might have satisfied his conscience by putting his *distinctive cloak* over the Surplice, thus hiding it from view, and the Romanistic clergy, who conformed in the reign of Elizabeth, might have donned the Chasuble upon the same principle ! But who ever attempted such an evasion. In the regulations of the Army and Navy, a certain uniform is prescribed, and who has ever resorted to such subterfuges ?

2. The advertisements were issued to establish uniformity "*without variety*" (see above judgment). But if it were allowable to wear a chasuble over the surplice, persons would have followed their own inclination, and the utmost diversity would have ensued. *Chasubles*

were destroyed by authority (see p. 33). It was not possible to wear them.

3. Again, it has been said that the advertisements and canons impose the surplice as a *minimum* arrangement, allowing those who object to the Mass vestments to wear it instead. But this again would be inconsistent with the establishment of uniformity. It would admit of the utmost variety (see above). Moreover, such a *minimum*, if chasuble and alb were the legal vestments, would be contrary to law. The rubric of 1549 assigns chasuble or cope to the celebrant, and if it be not modified legally by the “*other order*” of Queen Elizabeth, the surplice cannot be legally worn as the super vesture by the celebrant.

In short, the Advertisements of 1566 and Canons of 1604 completely set aside the mediæval sacerdotal vestments, and those also of the book of 1549, so far as they are allowed by its rubrics. The Judges in the Ridsdale case rightly observe:—“If, therefore, the use of the surplice at the administration of the Holy Communion was rendered lawful and obligatory by these ‘Advertisements,’ the use of albs or chasubles at that administration was rendered unlawful.”

The Usage of 1559 continued in 1662.—The revision of 1662, according to the Preface of the Prayer Book, made no change in the principles of the Church.

The rubric, or note of reference to the Act which was in the book of 1559 and 1604, was altered at the last review. We place the rubrics in juxtaposition, and the change will be seen at a glance.

Note or Rubric of 1604.

“And here is to be noted, that the Minister at the time of the communion, and at all other times in his ministration, shall use such ornaments in the Church, as were in use by authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward the VI, according to the Act of Parliament set in the beginning of the book.”

Rubric as it is.

“And here is to be noted, that such ornaments of the Church, and of the Ministers thereof, at all times of their ministration, shall be *retained*, and be in use, as were in this Church of England by the Authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth.”

The word *retained* was introduced, and the distinction between ministrations was abolished. It was no longer necessary to refer to the Act, which, however, remains in the sealed books.

The Preface to the Prayer Book gives the following explanation, amongst others, as to the reason of the changes made in 1662:—"First, for the *better* direction of them that are to officiate in any part of the Divine Service, which is chiefly done in the Calendars and *Rubrics*."

It is not difficult to discover the reason of the above change in the Rubric, or Notice. The Puritans had objected in the Savoy Conference that the Rubric "*seemeth to bring back*" the Cope, Albe, &c.—*Cardwell's Conf.*, p. 314.

As the Judges in the Ridsdale case observe—"The words (of the Puritans) did not suggest—and they would have been erroneous if they had suggested—more than that the Rubric had *the appearance* of giving them some legal authority."

The Revisers evidently adopted the word "*retained*" to show that such ornaments were to be used as had been in use. Dr. Stephens remarks:—

"It would be opposed to every Canon for the construction of language to apply in 1662 the word '*retained*' to the Chasuble and Alb. Such vestments had not only ceased to be in use since 1559, in any Parish Church in the country, but had been actually removed and *destroyed* by public authority."—*The Arg. Folkestone Case*, p. 435.

It is true that the word *retained* occurred in the Act of 1559, but this only strengthens our argument, as the mediæval vestments were then in use. They were not in use in 1662, and had not been for a hundred years, and therefore could not be *retained*.

The vestments which had been in use were the surplice, with hood, and cope in certain cases.

The Judges in the Purchas case made the following remarks as to the word "*retained*" introduced in 1662:—

"To retain means, in common parlance, to continue something

now in existence. It is reasonable to presume that the alteration was not made without some purpose, and it appears to their Lordships that the words of the Rubric strictly construed would not suffice to revive ornaments, which had been lawfully set aside, although they were in use in the second year of Edward VI."

Usage of the Church.—The usage of the Church has been unshaken. The Judges in the Ridsdale case remark—"The practice, consistent with the old law" (that of the advertisements), "inconsistent with the argument of the appellant" (Mr. Ridsdale), "has been *uniform, open, continuous, and under authoritative sanction.*" Here the maxim applies—"Contemporanea *expositio fortissima est in lege*—Contemporary exposition is the most forcible in law."

Thus, RECEPTION by the Church is conclusive. But reception is the authority of the Church, derived from the general body of the Church. Hooker says:—

"The Canons, even of General Councils, have but the force of wise men's opinions concerning that whereof they treat, till they be publicly assented unto where they are to take place as laws; and that in giving such public assent as maketh a Christian kingdom subject unto those laws, the King's authority is the chiefest."—*Eccles. Pol.*, Book viii, ch. vi, 9.

On this point of usage, Sir Edmund Beckett, Chancellor of the Arch-Diocese of York, writes as follows, with his usual force and point:—"So that evidence of the usage alone would be enough, if there were not a word of anything else surviving, except that Act (of Uniformity, 1559). Of the universal usage, from the time of the advertisements till quite lately, there is no dispute. Moreover, the fact that the advertisements were completely authorized has been attested by nothing less than three Convocations in their Canons of 1571, only five years after the advertisements themselves; of 1603, and of 1640; which last calls them not only 'published in the seventh year of Elizabeth,' as the others do, but the 'Advertisements of Queen Elizabeth of blessed memory.' It does not signify, for this purpose, that the Canons of 1571 and 1640 were, or became invalid for different reasons" (see Cardwell's Synod). They are equally the

utterances of Convocation, to whose judgment we are now told that every such question ought to be referred. And what can be more ridiculous, than members and supporters of Convocation now setting up for knowing better what was done than three Convocations, within a century of the time when it was done."—*Letter to the Archbishop of York, on Courts Commission*, p. 34. Lond., 1883.

In this instance, reception exists not merely for an age, but for THREE CENTURIES, during which period the WHOLE EPISCOPATE have required, in the Lord's Supper, the use, not of the chasuble, but of the surplice. Is it imaginable that the **Canons** and universal reception of the Church, for three centuries, have been contrary to law, and that all the **Bishops** of the Church, during that period, were guilty of breaking the law, and liable to condign punishment?

SUPPLEMENT.

The Gown in the Pulpit.—Robertson remarks, on this point, and the rubric of 1549:—"In these circumstances, I believe it to have been the intention of the compilers, that the previous practice of the Church shall be our guide."—*On the Liturgy*, p. 91. London, 1869.

He alludes to the fact that "there is no special order" in the above rubric, as to the dress of the preacher. This being so, there is no difficulty in arriving at the conclusion that the gown is lawful as a preaching garb, for it is undoubted that its use was lawful according to the "previous," or pre-Reformation "practice" of the Church.

Before the Reformation, the office of preaching was rarely exercised. In the Middle Ages, the clergy were generally incapable of teaching. Archdeacon Sharp says:—

"But in the Pontificate of Innocent III, arose the preaching orders, as they were called; that is to say, *ordo Prædicatorum*

from St. Dominique and *ordo Fratrum minorum* from St. Francis. These were sent over to England by the Pope, with authority to preach in all places, even in the streets; and this power as granted to them, extensive and grievous as it was, being afterwards confirmed by a Constitution of Clement V, was afterwards construed as a privilege established by a Canon law."—*On the Rubric*, p. 247. Lond., 1787.

The Preaching Friars wore their ordinary dress in the pulpit. The gown continued to be in use after the Reformation. It is expressly recorded that Mr. Day preached before Convocation in 1562, in the habit of a Bachelor of Divinity.

The Canons of 1571 gave the following direction:—

"In preaching they shall use a very modest and grave garment, which may become and adorn the minister of God, and such as is prescribed in the book of Advertisements."—*Sparrow's Collect.*, p. 238. Lond., 1671.

The Puritans ridiculed "the swouping black gown," and wore a cloak.

The Bishops, even the Caroline, sanctioned the gown in the pulpit.

Laud in his visitation articles inquired—

"Whether you have any lecturer in your parish, who hath preached in his cloak, and not in his gown."—*Second Ritual Report*, p. 48.

The Church of Ireland gives the following directions in her 4th Canon:—

"Every Archbishop and Bishop at all times of his public ministrion of the services of the Church shall use the customary ecclesiastical apparel of his order. And every Presbyter and Deacon at all times of his public ministrion of the services of the Church shall wear a plain white surplice with sleeves, and such minister may wear bands, and upon the surplice the customary scarf of plain black silk, and being a graduate of a University he may wear the hood pertaining to his degree. And no minister shall wear any other ecclesiastical vestment or ornament: Provided that any minister shall be at liberty to wear a plain black gown when preaching. And if any question shall arise, touching the suitableness of any vestment or ornament worn by any minister during the public ministrions of the services of the Church, the same shall be decided by the Ordinary, subject to an appeal to the Court of the General Synod."

CHAPTER XIII.

MORNING AND EVENING PRAYER.

The Opening Sentences were added by our Reformers in 1552. Comber analyzes them as follows:—

- “I. Support to the fearful, Ps. li. 9; Ps. cxlii. 2; Jer. x. 24.
- II. Comfort to the doubtful, Ps. li. 17; Dan. ix. 9, 10; Luke xv. 18, 19.
- III. Instruction to the ignorant, 1 John i. 8, 9; Ezek. xiii. 27.
- IV. Admonition to the negligent, Ps. ii. 3; Matt. iii. 2. V. Call to the formal, Joel ii. 13.

The Opening Address was composed by our Reformers. It sets forth the purposes for which we meet: (1) to Confess our sins “to Almighty God,” (2) to “render thanks,” (3) “to set forth His most worthy praise,” (4) “to hear His most Holy Word,” and (5) “to ask those things which are requisite and necessary as well for the body as the soul.” It thus recognizes *public confession* of sin made “with an humble, lowly, penitent, and obedient heart” as sufficient for Divine forgiveness. This is in opposition to the mediæval and Tridentine doctrine that *private confession* to the priest is essential.—See p. 183.

The General Confession, “to be said of the whole congregation after the Minister,” was composed by our Reformers. It recognizes not only the frailness but the moral corruption of man. It reaches a climax in the words, “And there is no health in us.”

The Absolution was composed by our Reformers. It consists of (1) an introduction, (2) the absolution proper, and (3) closes with an exhortation. The absolution is the declaration: “He pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly repent and unfeignedly believe His holy Gospel.”

Some appear to hold that forgiveness is conveyed to the truly penitent in this public absolution. But the exhortation which follows is inconsistent with that

idea: "Wherefore let us beseech Him to grant us true repentance and His Holy Spirit." On the subject of Absolution.—See chap. xviii, sec. iii.

The words, "or remission of sins," were introduced, as explanatory, in the revision of 1604, at the suggestion of the Puritans. The word Priest was substituted for Minister in 1662. The word "alone" denotes that the absolution is not to be pronounced by the congregation and priest together, as in the Confession which it follows. (On the meaning of the word priest, see chap. xxi.) The rubric directing the people to say "Amen" was brought to its present form in 1662:—"The people shall answer here and at the end of all *other prayers*, Amen." This shows that in the view of the revisers the absolution is not only declaratory but *precatory*.

The mediæval service opened at Matins with the *Pater Noster* and *Ave Maria*. The Reformers rejected the *Ave Maria* or "Hail Mary," but retained the Lord's Prayer in 1549 at the beginning of the service. In 1552 the Lord's Prayer was placed in its present position.

The following are the rubrics of 1549 and 1552:—

RUBRIC OF 1549.

"The Priest being in the quire, shall begin with a loud voice, the Lord's Prayer, called the *Pater Noster*."

RUBRIC OF 1552.

"Then shall the Minister begin the Lord's Prayer with a loud voice."—*After the Absolution.*

So the rubric stood till 1662, when it was brought to its present form:—

RUBRIC OF 1662.

"Then the minister shall kneel and say the Lord's Prayer with an audible voice; the people also kneeling and repeating it with him, both here and wheresoever else it is used in the divine service."

On this rubric Dr. Stephens says:—

"It has by some been thought that the people are not to repeat the Lord's Prayer with the Minister in the *Communion* office. But the words 'both here and wheresoever else it is used in the Divine

Service,' added to the rubric at the last review, contain a plain general direction which a thousand repetitions could not have made more express."—*Notes, in loco.*

The practice of audible repetition by the minister *alone* can hardly be justified by the rubric preceding the Lord's Prayer in that office—"the Priest shall say the Lord's Prayer"—when it is taken with the above rubric which directs that the people shall repeat it wherever it occurs in "the Divine Service."

In the Roman offices, the prayer was repeated inaudibly by the Priest, till he came to the words, "And lead us not into temptation." The prayer closed with the words "but deliver us from evil." The Puritans at the Savoy suggested that the Doxology should be added.

The VERSICLES, or short verses which follow, are alternate ejaculations of minister and people, taken from Psalms li. 15; lxx. 1. They, as Whytehead remarks, "as quick darts, shot up to Heaven animate the feelings of the worshippers, and express their dependence upon God for power."—*Key to the Prayer Book.*

The rubric: "Here all standing up, the Priest shall say," was added in 1661. Then follows the doxology, with the exhortation, "Praise ye the Lord," and the response, which was added in 1661: "The Lord's name be praised."

This doxology, called the *Gloria Patri*, from the opening words in Latin, is sometimes called the lesser doxology, to distinguish it from that which begins—"Glory be to God on high," occurring in the Communion Service.

The 95th Psalm, as introductory to the Psalms, occurs in the Morning Service, but not in the Evening. This psalm is designated the *invitatory*, from its opening, "O come." It should not be confounded with *invitatories* used before the Reformation, in the singing of this psalm in particular, and of the psalms in general, by which the continuous flow was interrupted.—See p. 39.

The rubric of the Prayer Book of 1549, directed the 95th Psalm to be said or sung without any invitatory.

The Psalms follow, to be read through in the month. The version used is that of the Bible, published in 1540, by authority called “the Great Bible.” It was retained, probably, on account of its greater suitability to psalmody than the new version.

Harding, in defence of Latin service, employed a *tu quoque* argument, and contended that the simple people understand not the deep meaning of the Psalms. Jewel, in reply, remarks that, “albeit (although) the people understand not all the high mysteries of the Scriptures, yet it followeth not that therefore they understand nothing in the Scriptures. For, in the Scriptures there is both strong meat for men, and also milk for children; and ‘in the same,’ saith St. Gregory, ‘the elephant may swim, and the lamb may wade afoot.’” Jewel proceeds to show that all classes in the Church, from the earliest days, were familiar with the Psalms:—“St. Hierome saith, ‘the poor husbandman sung the psalms at his plough.’ St. Basil exhorteth the artificer ‘to sing psalms in his shop.’ Apollinaris turned the psalms into Greek verses, that children might learn them in the schools. St. Chrysostom saith unto the Father, ‘Teach thy child to sing the psalms.’”—*Controv. with Harding*, p. 331. P.S.

Archbishop Secker remarks that, “the Jews anciently recited them in the Temple, and do still, in their Synagogues; the New Testament doth recommend them to Christians, and the whole Church has sung them ever since.”—*Quoted in Stephens’ Notes, in loco.*

The alternate use is not required by the rubrics, but is of great authority, being in accordance with the custom of the Christian Church for ages past. Cartwright objected to it, as though it were a grave error, but Hooker vigorously contended for it, pleading not merely Christian custom, but angelic worship:—“*One cried to another, saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Hosts, the whole earth is full of His glory*” (Isaiah vi. 3). He asserts that the custom had been

in use in the Church for “twelve hundred years.”—*Eccles. Pol.*, B. v, No. xxxix.

Dr. Hammond remarks, that “these sacred hymns are indeed admirably suited for every purpose of devotion. They finely illustrate the connection which exists between the two Covenants, and shed an evangelical light on the Mosaic dispensation, by unveiling its inward radiance.”—*Quoted by Stephens*, as before.

The doxology to the Triune Lord, at the end of the Psalms, expressly appropriates them to Christian devotion.

It is unnecessary here to dwell upon their history and interpretation. Commentaries upon the Psalms, in every form, are accessible to all. Mr. Thrupp truly remarks, that “in the Christian Church, devotional familiarity with the Psalter has rendered the number of Commentaries immense.”

The **Te Deum** is so-called from the opening words in Latin. Its authorship has been attributed to Hilary of Poictiers, who lived in the 4th century, and to others: the question has not been decided. The nature of this hymn of praise was well expressed in the *Prymer* of 1545, as follows:—“The praise of God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.”

Whytehead remarks:—“After listening to the preceding portion of Holy Scripture, how appropriately does the Church burst forth in this noble hymn, ascribing glory and honour to the eternal Trinity, and calling upon heaven and earth to re-echo the song of praise. It consists of three parts: first, an act of adoration; secondly, a confession of faith, embracing distinctly the several persons in the Godhead, and the union of the Divine and human natures in the incarnation of Christ, with his sufferings and glory; and thirdly, a prayer for ourselves and the whole Church that we may be partakers of God’s grace, enjoy his favour, and be kept by his power through faith unto salvation. In this truly wonderful hymn, the Church militant seems almost to soar up to the choirs of the Church triumphant,

and to anticipate the songs—the services of the blessed above.”—*P. 46*, as before.

The Benedicite (“Bless ye the Lord”), so called from the opening words in Latin, is a paraphrase of the 148th Psalm. It is taken from the Septuagint translation of the Book of Daniel, where it occurs in the 3rd chapter after the 23rd verse. In the book of 1549, its use was appointed for Lent, and in 1552 this speciality was omitted.

The Benedictus (“Blessed be the Lord”), “the Song of Zacharias” appropriately follows, or the **Jubilate** as an alternative. The rubric relating to the *Benedictus* in the book of 1549, directed it to be used “throughout the whole year,” after the Second Lesson. The *Jubilate* was introduced in 1552. The rubric, as settled in 1662, directs that the *Benedictus* shall be read after the Second Lesson, “except when that shall happen to be read in the chapter for the day, or for the Gospel on St. John Baptist’s day.” It does not follow from this that the *Benedictus* may not be used on other occasions. The rubric as to the *Jubilate* is general. “*Or this Psalm Jubilate Deo, Psalm C.*” These hymns of thanksgiving and praise appropriately follow the Lesson from the New Testament.

The Magnificat—Evening Service—(“My soul doth magnify the Lord,” or the 98th Psalm, **Cantate Domino** (“O sing unto the Lord”), is appointed to be said after the First Lesson. The 98th Psalm is not to be chosen “when it is read in the ordinary course of the Psalms.” As Whytehead remarks, “the latter bears a considerable resemblance to the former hymn, and seems to express the same triumphant assurance of the Lord’s goodness in *anticipation*, as the Magnificat does upon joyful *experience*.”—*P. 47*, as before.

The Nunc Dimittis (“Lord now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace”), or the **Deus Misereatur**, 67th Psalm (“God be merciful”), follows the Second Lesson. The latter is not to be said on the twelfth day of the month, as it occurs in the Psalms of the day.

The *Cantate Domino* and the *Deus Misereatur*, as alternative, were introduced in 1552.

The Apostles' Creed is so called because it contains the doctrines which they taught. The truths which it teaches were held substantially from Apostolic times, but their formulation was a gradual process. Ireneus, at the end of the 1st century, and Tertullian at the beginning of the second, set forth the doctrines which Christians believed.

Tertullian says :—

“ That there is only one God, neither is there any other than the Creator of the world, who has produced all things out of nothing through his own Word, first of all sent down ; that the Word, called his Son under the name of God, seen in divers manners by the patriarchs, heard at all times in the prophets, at last brought down by the Spirit and power of God the Father, in the Virgin Mary, was made flesh in her womb, and having been born of her, went forth Jesus Christ ; thenceforth that he preached the new law, and the new promise of the Kingdom of Heaven ; that he worked miracles ; that he was crucified ; that on the third day he rose from the dead ; that received into the Heavens he sat down on the right hand of God ; that he sent forth the vicarial power of the Holy Spirit, who leads those who believe ; that he will come with glory to take the Saints to the enjoyment of everlasting life, and of the heavenly promises, and to condemn the wicked to perpetual fire, after the revival of both classes with the restoration of the flesh.”—*De Præscrip. Hæretic.*, c. xiii.

This compendium on the most essential points, is similar to the Apostles' Creed, but differs from it somewhat in its form of expression. It makes no reference, however, to the articles, the descent into Hell, “the holy Catholic Church,” “the Communion of Saints” and the “forgiveness of sin.” The same remark applies to the profession of faith given by Ireneus.—*Adv. Heres*, lib. i, c. 10.

Rufinus, who lived in the 4th century, has left a commentary on the creed, as it existed in his day in the Church of Aquileia—a creed in which the words *invisible* and *impassible* were added to the word Almighty—against the Patripassians, who held that the Father suffered on Calvary, and which also contained the article regarding the descent into Hell, with

other differences. The article of the descent did not exist in the ancient form of the Roman creed.

Burnet's remark is warranted by facts when he says "that there was no common form delivered to all the Churches."—*On Article VIII.*

The Church of England has not defined the meaning of the word *hell* as it occurs in the Creed. The third of the forty-two articles of religion contained the following words in addition to the article as it is:—

"For the body" (of Christ) "lay in the Sepulchre until the resurrection, but His ghost departing from Him was with the ghosts that were in prison, or in hell, and did preach to the same, as the place of St. Peter doth testify."

But this latter statement as to his descent to the spirits in prison was struck out in 1563, when the second book of Homilies was published, which teaches that the soul of man "goeth straightway either to Heaven or else to Hell" (Third part concerning prayer). The word *Hades* (ἀδης) signifies simply *the world not seen*, and refers not only to the abode of the lost but of the righteous.

Lord Chancellor King remarks that the word *hell*, "according to its primary and original signification," "imports no more than an *invisible* and hidden place, being derived from the old Saxon word which signifies to hide, or from the participle thereof, 'helled,' that is to say, hidden or covered." Having remarked that the word "hele" is so used in the western parts of England, he adds that "the word 'hell,' according to its primitive notion, exactly answers to the Greek word ἀδης, 'Hades,' which means an unseen place."—*On the Apostles' Creed*, quoted by Stephens, "Notes, Legal and Historical."

Christ's spirit went into Paradise. "*This day thou shalt be with me in Paradise*" (Luke xxiii. 43). As Burnet remarks, the article imports that "His soul was neither in His body nor hovering about it, ascending and descending upon it, as some of the Jews fancied souls did for some time after death, but that his soul was really moved out of His body, and carried to those

unseen regions of departed spirits among whom it continued till His resurrection.”—*On Article III.*

We are not in any way bound to the opinion of those who hold that the place of departed spirits is beneath the surface of the earth—an opinion which even the Romanist, in these days, would find it hard to avow. Christ’s soul was separated from His body, and entered into the world of spirits, thus submitting, or descending to all the conditions of mortality. His humiliation was complete. His body was laid in the grave, and His spirit entered into the regions of the dead.

The word “*Catholic*” does not appear in the earliest creeds. It denotes *general* to distinguish the Church from the heretics, who separated from the general body of Christians, and formed separate parties. Dr. Littledale rightly says:—“At best the name of ‘Catholic’ is not of Divine or Apostolic appointment, but of post-Apostolic or human introduction, and therefore not inherently sacred.”—*Reasons for not joining the Church of Rome.* Note C.

Still, the word is rightly used. The pretension of Rome to the exclusive use of the title cannot stand. Protestants hold the Catholic faith (as defined by the Athanasian Creed) and the Greek Church is entitled, “The Catholic Orthodox Eastern Church.”

The words “*Communion of Saints*” were added as a further appellative of the Church, whose members have communion with each other in the One Great Head (1 John i. 1-3). But this Communion does not admit of the invocation of those who are separated from us by space whether on earth, or in Heaven. God only knows the heart: God only can hear.—1 Kings viii. 39.

The Athanasian Creed, as explanatory of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, seems to have been intended at first for the clergy. Its authorship is uncertain. Some authorities have maintained that it was composed by Athanasius who was distinguished for his opposition to Arius, but there are grave objections to this opinion. Dr. Waterland, in his learned work on the subject, thinks that

Hilary, Bishop of Arles, who lived in the 5th century, was its author. But others dispute the justness of this conclusion. Its authorship, however, though an interesting question, is not one of great importance. Professor Lumby remarks, "that though the language of the creed is very ancient, it was not brought together till the middle of the 9th century."—*The Prayer Book with Comment.* S. P. C. K.

The Church states that the three Creeds are to be received because "they may be proved by most certain warrants of holy Scripture."—*Article VIII.*

It is worthy of observation that, according to this creed, "the Catholic faith" consists of the doctrine of the Trinity, incarnation, and atonement.

The following declaration was made by the Convocation of the Southern Province in 1879:—

"For the removal of doubts and to prevent disquietude in the use of the creed commonly called the Creed of St. Athanasius, it is hereby solemnly declared (1) That the Confession of our Christian faith, commonly called the Creed of St. Athanasius, doth not make any addition to the faith as contained in holy Scripture, but warneth against errors, which from time to time have arisen in the Church of England; (2) That as holy Scripture in divers places doth promise life to them that believe, and declare the condemnation of them that believe not, so doth the Church in this confession declare the necessity for all who would be in a state of salvation of holding fast the Catholic faith, and the great peril of rejecting the same. Wherefore the warnings in this confession of faith are to be understood no otherwise than the like warnings of holy Scripture, for we must receive God's threatenings, even as His promises in such wise as they are generally set forth in Holy Writ. Moreover, the Church doth not herein pronounce judgment on any particular person or persons, God alone being the Judge of all."

This Creed occupies its place in the revised Prayer Book of the Church of Ireland, but the rubric requiring its use has been omitted.

The Nicene Creed occurs in the *Communion Service*, but it may be well to notice it here with the other creeds. It, or rather the greater part of it, was drawn up in the Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325, convened by the Emperor Constantine to settle the disputes which divided the Church, and which had been occasioned by the teaching of Arius, a Presbyter of Alexandria.

A great controversy arose as to the word *ὁμοούσιον* (homoousion), “of the same substance.” The semi-Arians adopted the word *ὁμοιούσιον* (Homoiousion), “of like substance.” The question appeared to be one of mere words, but grave issues were involved. The Arians were divided into parties; some of them holding that the Son was unlike the Father. The creed expresses the orthodox faith that the Son is of “one substance with the Father.”

The words *And from the Son** were added to a creed read by Reccared, King of the Goths, in a Council held in Toledo, A.D. 589. This addition, in course of time, led to a bitter controversy between the Eastern and the Western Church.

Turning to the East, during the recital of the creeds, is not sanctioned by any rubric or canon of the Church of England. This practice has been customary in cathedrals, but not in parish churches.

Its advocates seem to be at a loss for a well-grounded reason. Wheatly and others allege, that probably the majesty of God “is, in a peculiar manner, in that part of the Heavens” (“Rationale,” p. 85, as before). But Dr. Stephens truly remarks, that this reason “is very fanciful, because east and west are relative to the earth’s rotation.”—*Notes on the Prayer Book, in loco*, as before.

Procter states, that the Jews turned towards Jerusalem, or the mercy-seat; but the Jews, living to the east of Jerusalem, would turn to the west.

Romanists turn to the *Host* on the altar, and many of their churches have no reference to the points of the compass.

The Communion table, in the Church of England, may stand in the body of the church; in which case, some turning to the east, would turn their backs upon the holy table.

The Lesser Litany, consisting of three short petitions

* *Filioque.*

(Lord, have mercy upon us. Christ have mercy upon us. Lord have mercy upon us), follows the salutation, "The Lord be with you," "And with Thy Spirit." Then the minister, clerks, and people are directed to say the Lord's Prayer with a loud voice.

The **Clerks** were those who led in the responses; usually there is now but one clerk in each church. In the pre-Reformation service, the priest repeated the prayer in a low voice to the words "lead us not into temptation," when both priest and people united in the concluding petition in a higher strain.

The **Versicles** which follow are taken from the Psalms lxxxv. 7; xx. 9; cxxxii. 9; xxviii. 9. The versicle, "Give peace," &c., with its response, is an ancient antiphon, connected with the Collect for Peace. The sixth versicle is taken from Psalm li. 10, 11.

The Collect for the day follows, and is succeeded by the Collect for Peace and the Collect for Grace.

"The second Collect, for Peace," is in the Liturgy edited by Gelasius, A.D. 494. No doubt it had been in use before that date.

"The third Collect, for Grace," is in the Liturgy, edited by Gregory, A.D. 594.

These collects succeeding the collect for the day, which is the first, are entitled the second and third.

"The second Collect at Evening Prayer" for "the peace which the world cannot give," and "rest and quietness," is derived from the Liturgy of Gelasius, A.D. 494.

"The third Collect, for aid against all perils," is also derived from the same ancient source.

The rubric was added in 1661, stating that in choirs and places where they sing, here followeth the **"Anthem."**

The word **Anthem**, when introduced, denoted not only selections from Scripture, but metrical Psalms and Hymns. In the reign of Elizabeth, a metrical composition was sung by authority, after Evening Prayer, entitled "An anthem or prayer for the pre-

servation of the Church, the Queen's Majesty, and the Realm, to be sung after Evening Prayer at all times."

"*A Prayer for the Queen's Majesty*," is a modified form of "*A Prayer for the Kinge*," composed in the reign of Henry VIII, and occurring in a book entitled "*Psalmes or Prayers taken out of Holy Scripture*," A.D. 1545.

"*A Prayer for the Royal Family*," first appeared at the end of the Litany in 1604. Its composition has been attributed to Archbishop Whitgift. It was modified in 1661.

"*A Prayer for the Clergy and People*," is in the Liturgy of Gelasius, A.D. 494.

"*A Prayer of St. Chrysostom*," is derived from the Liturgies of Basil and Chrysostom. Its authorship is not known. Cranmer placed it at the end of the Litany in 1544. It was added to Morning and Evening Prayer in 1661.

The Benediction is taken from 2 Cor. xiii. 14. It is entitled a *prayer* in the rubric—"then these five prayers following, are to be read here."—*Rubric before the Prayer for the Queen's Majesty*.

The Benediction, therefore, in the view of the Church of England, is precatory.

"*Prayers and Thanksgivings* upon several occasions," with the *dates* of their composition or insertion:—

Prayers.—"For Rain," A.D. 1549, added to the collects at the end of the Communion Service.

"For Fair Weather," A.D. 1549, in the same place.

"In the times of Dearth and Famine," two prayers, A.D. 1552 in the Litany.

"In the Time of War and Tumults," A.D. 1552, after the Litany, the word *tumults* added 1661.

"In the Time of any Common Plague or Sickness," A.D. 1552, after the Litany.

"In the Ember Weeks," two prayers, A.D. 1661.

"A Prayer that may be said after any of the former,"

A.D. 1544, in the Litany, from Gregory's Liturgy, A.D. 594.

“A Prayer for the High Court of Parliament” appeared in 1625, and was inserted in the Prayer Book in 1661.

“A Collect or Prayer for all conditions of men,” attributed to Bishop Sanderson, was inserted in 1661.

Thanksgivings.—“A *General Thanksgiving*,” composed by Bishop Reynolds, was added in 1661.

The special thanksgivings which follow, “For Rain,” “For Fair Weather,” “For Plenty,” “For Peace and Deliverance from our Enemies,” “For Deliverance from the Plague, or other Common Sickness,” and the alternative, were added in 1604, at the suggestion of the Puritans.

The thanksgiving “for restoring Public Peace at Home,” was added in 1661.

Shortened Services.—An Act was passed, July 18th, 1872, in pursuance of a report of a Royal Commission, appointed in 1869, for the amendment of the Act of Uniformity, in order to provide for the use of Shortened Services, specified in the Schedule of the Act. We give now its provisions with the shortened forms of service. After certain definitions, *numbered 1*, the Act proceeds as follows :—

“2. The shortened Order for Morning Prayer or for Evening Prayer, specified in the schedule to this Act, may, on any day except Sunday, Christmas Day, Ash Wednesday, Good Friday, and Ascension Day, be used, if in a cathedral in addition to, and if in a church in lieu of, the Order for Morning Prayer or for Evening Prayer respectively prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer.

“3. Upon any special occasion approved by the ordinary, there may be used in any cathedral or church a special form of service approved by the ordinary, so that there be not introduced into such service anything, except anthems or hymns, which does not form part of the Holy Scriptures or Book of Common Prayer.

“4. An additional form of service varying from any form prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer may be used at any hour on any Sunday or holy-day in any cathedral or church in which there are duly read, said, or sung as required by law on such Sunday or holy-day at some other hour or hours the Order for Morning Prayer, the Litany, such part of the Order for the Administration of the Lord’s Supper or Holy Communion as is required to be read on Sundays and holy-days if there be no Communion, and the Order for Evening Prayer, so that there be not introduced into such additional service any portion of the Order for the Administration of the Lord’s Supper or Holy Communion, or anything, except anthems or hymns, which does not form part of the Holy Scriptures or Book of Common Prayer, and so that such form of service and the mode in which it is used is for the time being approved by the ordinary; provided that nothing in this section shall affect the use of any portion of the Book of Common Prayer as otherwise authorized by the Act of Uniformity or this Act.

“5. Whereas doubts have arisen as to whether the following forms of service, that is to say, the Order for Morning Prayer, the Litany, and the Order for the Administration of the Lord’s Supper or Holy Communion, may be used as separate services, and it is expedient to remove such doubts: Be it therefore enacted and declared that any of such forms of service may be used together or in varying order as separate services, or that the Litany may be said after the third collect in the Order for Evening Prayer, either in lieu of or in addition to the use of the Litany in the Order for Morning Prayer, without prejudice nevertheless to any legal powers vested in the ordinary; and any of the said forms of service may be used with or without the preaching of a sermon or lecture, or the reading of a homily.

“6. Whereas doubts have arisen as to whether a sermon or lecture may be preached without the

common prayers and services appointed by the Book of Common Prayer for the time of day being previously read, and it is expedient to remove such doubts: Be it therefore enacted and declared, that a sermon or lecture may be preached without the common prayers or services appointed by the Book of Common Prayer being read before it is preached, so that such sermon or lecture be preceded by any service authorized by this Act, or by the Bidding Prayer, or by a collect taken from the Book of Common Prayer, with or without the Lord's Prayer.

“7. Nothing in this Act shall affect the provision with respect to the chapels or colleges in the universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and Durham, which is contained in section six of the Universities Tests Act, 1871.

“8. The schedule to this Act, and the notes thereto and directions therein, shall be construed and have effect as part of this Act.

“9. This Act may be cited as ‘The Act of Uniformity Amendment Act, 1872.’”

SCHEDULE.

NOTE.—The Minister using the Shortened Order for Morning Prayer or for Evening Prayer in this Schedule, may in his discretion add in its proper place any exhortation, prayer, canticle, hymn, psalm, or lesson, contained in the Order for Morning Prayer or Evening Prayer in the Book of Common Prayer and omitted or authorized to be omitted from such shortened order.

Each of the twenty-two portions into which the one hundred and nineteenth psalm is divided in the Book of Common Prayer shall be deemed, for the purposes of this schedule, to be a separate psalm.

SHORTENED FORMS OF SERVICE.

THE SHORTENED ORDER FOR MORNING PRAYER DAILY THROUGHOUT THE YEAR, EXCEPT ON SUNDAY, CHRISTMAS DAY, ASH WEDNESDAY, GOOD FRIDAY, AND ASCENSION DAY.

At the beginning of Morning Prayer the Minister shall read with a loud voice some one or more of these sentences of the Scriptures that follow.

When the wicked man, &c.

A General Confession to be said of the whole Congregation after the Minister, all kneeling.

Almighty and most merciful Father, &c.

The Absolution, or Remission of sins, to be pronounced by the Priest alone, standing ; the people still kneeling.

Almighty God, the Father, &c.

The people shall answer here, and at the end of all other prayers, Amen.

Then the Minister shall kneel, and say the Lord's Prayer with an audible voice ; the people also kneeling, and repeating it with him.

Our Father, which art in heaven, &c.

Then likewise he shall say,

O Lord, open thou our lips.
&c. &c. &c.

Here all standing up, the Priest shall say,

Glory be to the Father, &c.

Then shall follow one or more of the Psalms appointed. And at the end of every Psalm throughout the year, and likewise at the end of Benedicite, Benedictus, Magnificat, and Nunc dimittis, shall be repeated.

Glory be to the Father, &c.

Then shall be read distinctly, with an audible voice, either the First Lesson taken out of the Old Testament as is appointed in the Calendar, or the Second Lesson taken out of the New Testament, except there be a Proper Lesson assigned for that day, in which case the Proper Lesson shall be read, and if there are two Proper Lessons each shall be read in its proper place ; he that readeth so standing and turning himself as he may best be heard of all such as are present.

Note that before every Lesson the Minister shall say, Here beginneth such a Chapter, or Verse of such a Chapter, of such a Book. And after every Lesson, Here endeth the Lesson, or the First or the Second Lesson.

And after the Lesson, or between the First and Second Lessons, shall be said or sung in English one of the following :

Either the Hymn called, Te Deum Laudamus.

We praise thee, O God, &c.

Or this Canticle, Benedictite, omnia opera.

O all ye works of the Lord, &c.

Or the Hymn following (except when that shall happen to be read in the Lesson for the day, or for the Gospel on Saint John Baptist's Day) :

Benedictus. St. Luke i. 68.

Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, &c.

Or this Psalm :

Jubilate Deo.

O be joyful in the Lord, all ye lands, &c.

Then shall be sung or said the Apostles' Creed by the Minister and the people standing.

I believe in God the Father Almighty, &c.

And after that, the people all devoutly kneeling, the Minister shall pronounce with a loud voice,

The Lord be with you.

Answer. And with thy spirit.

Minister. Let us pray.

Then the Priest shall say,

O Lord, show thy mercy upon us.
&c. &c. &c.

Then shall follow three Collects. The first for the day, which shall be the same that is appointed at the Communion; the second for Peace; the third for grace to live well; and the two last Collects shall never alter, but daily be said at Morning Prayer throughout all the year, as followeth, all kneeling.

The second Collect for Peace.

O God, who art the author of peace, &c.

The third Collect for Grace.

O Lord, our heavenly Father, &c.

Here may follow an Anthem or Hymn:

Then these two Prayers following:

A Prayer of Saint Chrysostome.

Almighty God, who hast given us grace, &c.

2 Corinthians xiii.

The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, &c.

Here endeth the Shortened Order of Morning Prayer.

THE SHORTENED ORDER FOR EVENING PRAYER DAILY THROUGHOUT THE YEAR, EXCEPT ON SUNDAY, CHRISTMAS DAY, ASH WEDNESDAY, GOOD FRIDAY, AND ASCENSION DAY.

At the beginning of Evening Prayer the Minister shall read with a loud voice some one or more of these sentences of the Scriptures that follow:

When the wicked man, &c.

A general Confession to be said of the whole Congregation after the Minister, all kneeling.

Almighty and most merciful Father, &c.

The Absolution, or Remission of sins to be pronounced by the Priest alone, standing; the people still kneeling.

Almighty God, the Father, &c.

Then the Minister shall kneel, and say the Lord's Prayer; the people also kneeling, and repeating it with him.

Our Father, which art in heaven, &c.

Then likewise he shall say,

O Lord open thou our lips.

Here all standing up, the Priest shall say,

Glory be to the Father, &c.

Then shall be said or sung one or more of the Psalms in order as they be appointed. Then either a Lesson of the Old Testament as it is appointed, or a Lesson of the New Testament as it is appointed, except there be a Proper Lesson assigned for that day, in which case the Proper Lesson shall be read, and if there are two Proper Lessons each shall be read in its proper place; and after the Lesson, or between the First and Second Lessons, shall be said or sung in English one of the following:

Either Magnificat, or the Song of the Blessed Virgin Mary, in English, as follows:

Magnificat. St. Luke i.

My soul doth magnify the Lord, &c.

Or this Psalm (except it be on the nineteenth day of the month, when it is read in the ordinary course of the Psalms):

Cantate Domino. Psalm xcviii.

O sing unto the Lord a new song, &c.

Or Nunc Dimittis (or the Song of Simeon) as followeth:

Nunc Dimittis. St. Luke ii. 29.

Lord, now lettest thou thy servant, &c.

Or else this Psalm (except it be on the twelfth day of the month):

Deus misereatur. Psalm lxvii.

God be merciful unto us and bless us, &c.

Then shall be said or sung the Apostles' Creed by the Minister and the people, standing:

I believe in God the Father Almighty, &c.

And after that, the people all devoutly kneeling, the Minister shall pronounce with a loud voice,

The Lord be with you.

Answer. And with thy spirit.

Minister. Let us pray.

Then the Priest shall say,

O Lord, show they mercy upon us.

&c. &c. &c.

Then shall follow three Collects. The first of the day; the second for Peace; the third for aid against all perils, as hereafter followeth; which two last Collects shall be daily said at Evening Prayer without alteration.

The second Collect at Evening Prayer.

O God, from whom all holy desires, &c.

The third Collect for Aid against all Perils.

Lighten our darkness, &c.

Here may follow an Anthem or Hymn.

A Prayer of St. Chrysostome.

Almighty God who hast given us grace, &c.

2 Corinthians xiii.

The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, &c.

Here endeth the Shortened Order of Evening Prayer.

Daily Service.—The Notice “concerning the Service of the Church” at the close gives the following direction:—

“And the Curate that ministereth in every Parish Church or Chapel, being at home, *and not being otherwise reasonably hindered*, shall say the same in the Parish Church or Chapel where he ministereth, and shall cause a bell to be tolled thereunto a convenient time before he begin, that the people may come to hear God's word, and to pray with him.”

Upon this, Cripps makes the following remark:—

“The Book of Common Prayer furnishes us with a form of daily service throughout the year. And if it were not so, there would be no legal form of service which could ever be performed daily,

however great the emergency; but there is no direction in the Rubric, nor can any inference be drawn from it, that this was to be used daily in every Church."—*P. 630. Lond., 1857.*

In answer to the question whether a Bishop could enforce daily service, Cripps says:—

"There appears to be little difficulty in arriving at the conclusion that he could not."—*Ibid.*

The following considerations prove that the Church has not established an absolute rule on the point:—

1. The direction, given above by the Notice, admits of a reasonable hindrance. The book of 1552 specifies "preaching, studying of divinity, or some other urgent cause" as such.—*The Preface.*

2. The Service itself supposes the presence of a congregation.

3. The Curate is directed by the ringing of the bell to give notice of the service.

Bishop Blomfield remarks:—

"That the framers of the Rubric did not intend to insist upon an uninterrupted daily performance of Divine Service, appears, I think, from the direction given to the Curate, that when it is performed he shall cause a bell to be tolled a convenient time before to give the people notice."—*Charge, 1842.*

4. It is clear from Canons and Injunctions that the use of daily service in all Churches was not contemplated.

The Royal Injunctions of 1549, of 1552, and of 1559 require service on Wednesday and Friday.

The Canons of 1571 and 1604 require Service on holidays, Wednesday and Friday.

CHAPTER XIV.

SECTION I.

THE LITANY OR GENERAL SUPPLICATION AND THE COLLECTS.

THE word Litany, meaning supplication, is properly descriptive of prayer in general. Mr. Jebb notes the

following facts in reference to the English Litany:—
 “ 1. In the Invocation the words ‘miserable sinners’ have been added in the true spirit of the Reformed Liturgy of the Church, which in all her services lays a due stress upon the sinfulness of man’s nature. 2. The unjustifiable and superstitious invocation of saints is omitted, a practice which Walafridus Strabo (*De Rebus Ecclesiast. Cap. de Litanis*), as Bishop Cosin remarks, confessed to be a novelty.”—*The Book of Common Prayer*, by Archibald John Stephens. London, 1849.

The Origin of the Litany.—Comber remarks:—“It may be noted that it hath a resemblance of most of the ancient forms, but is *not the same with any one*, having so extracted the marrow of them all that we may justly esteem it to be the best in this kind that ever was; it is larger than those of the Greek Church, and shorter than that of the Latin, having cut off those impious and impertinent addresses to the Saints, whose names are one half of the Roman Litany, and yet adding some useful petitions instead of those, and putting everything in a most admirable method.”

Cranmer in 1544 had before him the Litany, as reformed by Archbishop Hermann, of Cologne, in his *Consultation*. He adopted various hints from the latter in the preparation of the Litany, which he now gave to the public. He expunged numerous invocations of Saints, retaining only three clauses, already quoted (p. 24). These clauses do not appear in the book of 1549. Cranmer added, as already stated, the words “miserable sinners” to the opening petitions. He recast the service, and introduced new subjects of prayer. The following petition, with others, was composed by him:—

“ That it may please thee to illuminate all Bishops, Priests and Deacons with true knowledge and understanding of thy *word*; and that both by their preaching and living they may set *it* forth and show *it* accordingly.”

Palmer endeavours to trace this to the Hereford

Litany and the Apostolical Constitutions,—two sources separated by many centuries !

But the resemblance consists only in the fact that the petition has reference to the clergy, as it appears from the following translation :—

“ That Thou wouldst vouchsafe to preserve our Bishop and our Prelates, and us congregations committed to them in Thy holy service. We pray for our Presbyters, for all the ministry in Christ.”

In 1661 the word “ Priests ” was substituted for “ Pastors,” Cranmer’s expression.

Cranmer introduced the following clause in 1544 :— . . . “ from the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities . . . Good Lord, deliver us.”

This was dropped in 1559.

Liturgiologists have divided the Litany variously. We give the names of the authors and their divisions.

Comber.	Invocations, Deprecations, Intercessions, Supplications.
Wheatly.	Invocations, Deprecations, Intercessions, Supplications.
Nicholls.	Invocations, Deprecations, Obsecrations, Intercessions, Supplications.
Whytehead.	Invocations, Deprecations, Intercessions, Supplications.
Procter.	Invocations, Deprecations, Obsecrations, Intercessions, Versicles and Prayer.
Barry.	Two parts, second beginning at the Kyrie Eleison, which is called the lesser Litany, before the Lord’s Prayer. Divisions of the first part ; Deprecations, Obsecrations, Petitions,
M’Lear in S.P.C.K. book.	Invocations, Deprecations, Obsecrations, Intercessions, Supplications, Versicles, and Prayer.

Some of these divisions are fanciful. Those of Comber and Wheatly, the older Liturgiologists, seem

to be in accordance with the construction of the Litany, though it is a question whether Cranmer, in its preparation, had such an arrangement in view.

The **Invocations** include the first four clauses in which we call upon the Holy Trinity.

The **Deprecations** include the next nine clauses in which we pray for deliverance from evils. The latter clauses of the Deprecations may be regarded as **Obsecrations**, or prayers for deliverance on account of what Christ has done for us.

The **Intercessions** include the next twenty-one clauses, beginning at “we sinners do beseech thee.”

The **Supplications** include the remainder of the Litany.

The Benediction (2 Cor. xiii. 14) was added in 1559.

As to the general character of the Litany, Sparrow remarks:—“The Litany is not one long continued prayer, but broken into many short and pithy ejaculations, that the intention and devotion which is most necessary in prayer may not be dulled and vanish, as in a long prayer it is apt to do, but be quickened and intended by the many new and quick petitions, and the nearer the end the shorter and livelier it is, strengthening our devotions by raising in us an apprehension of our misery and distress, ready as it were to sink and perish, and therefore crying out, as the disciples did, ‘Master, save we perish; O Lamb of God, hear us; O Christ hear us; Lord have mercy upon us.’”—*Rationale of the Prayer Book*.

Faussett remarks:—“Of the countless vicissitudes of man’s state, health, sickness, wealth or poverty, life, the dying hour, and the judgment day, dangers by land or sea, the captive and the freeman, the mother and the infant child, the fatherless children and widows; no one person or state but has the balm of prayer applied to the peculiar wound, or peril, whether of body or soul. Lord grant us to be deeply thankful for such privileges.”—*Scrip. and Pr. Book*, p. 57.

The Litany was originally used in processions, and

on the occasion of national calamities. Mamertus appointed solemn Litanies or rogations, A.D. 460, to be said on the three days before Ascension, to invoke the Divine mercy on behalf of the City of Vienne on the Rhone, which had been visited by earthquakes. To this we owe the Rogation days. Litany processions were abolished in 1547 and again in 1559; but the perambulation of parishes was continued to mark *boundaries*, and the Litany was appointed to be said *in Church*. One of the Homilies in three parts relates to rogation days. Grindal in his Injunctions states that the perambulation of parishes shall be—

“ WITHOUT WEARING ANY SURPLICES, carrying of banners, or handbells, or staying at crosses, OR SUCH LIKE POPISH CEREMONIES.”

SECTION II.

COLLECTS ATTACHED TO EPISTLES AND GOSPELS WITH DATES.

There are several Liturgies, or *Sacramentaries*, as they are called, pertaining to the Lord's Supper, which are of great antiquity.

The Leonian has been ascribed to Leo, Bishop of Rome, A.D. 451, as its compiler. The date 451 below indicates his liturgy.

Gelasius, Bishop of Rome, A.D. 494, made considerable additions to the above. The date 494 below indicates his liturgy.

Gregory, Bishop of Rome, A.D. 594, performed a similar work. Palmer observes:—“He collected, arranged, improved, abbreviated.” He was “the reviser and improver, not the author of the Roman Liturgy” (“Origines,” p. 126, vol. i). The date 594 below indicates his liturgy. The dates are approximate.

Ambrose was Bishop of Milan, A.D. 374. The

Liturgy of Milan bears his name, but it by no means follows that the title is correct. Walafridus Strabo, A.D. 849, says Palmer, "is the earliest ecclesiastical writer who has been cited as speaking of the Ambrosian rite." Palmer supposes that he composed some prayers, and "this would partly account for the sacramentary, or collection of missæ used at Milan as being called by his name."

Leofric, Bishop of Exeter, gave a liturgy to his diocese—"written," according to Palmer, "probably about the ninth or tenth century." Many of our collects are found in this, but the author has deemed it desirable in the following references to limit his observations to the older forms, except in one case.

The Sarum, or Salisbury offices, were compiled by Osmund, Bishop of Salisbury, A.D. 1078, and Chancellor of England, and were generally adopted. With these, the uses of York, Bangor, and Lincoln, and the Roman offices coincided in the main.

In the early ages, there was great variety of ceremonial in different churches, each Bishop exercising a considerable discretion.

COLLECTS WITH DATES.

Advent, 1st and 2nd, 1549.

„ 3rd, 1662.

„ 4th, the Liturgy of A.D. 494.

Christmas, A.D. 1549.

St. Stephen's day, A.D. 1661.

St. John the Evangelist's day, A.D. 594.

The Innocents' day, A.D. 494. Altered in 1661.

The Sunday after Christmas day, same as for Christmas.

The Circumcision, A.D. 1549.

The Epiphany, A.D. 594.

„ 1st Sunday, A.D. 594.

„ 2nd „, A.D. 594.

The Epiphany, 3rd Sunday, A.D. 594.

- „ 4th „ A.D. 594. Altered in 1661.
- „ 5th „ A.D. 594.
- „ 6th „ A.D. 1661.

Septuagesima, A.D. 594.

Sexagesima, A.D. 594. Altered in 1549.

Quinquagesima, A.D. 1549.

Ash Wednesday, A.D. 1549.

Lent, 1st Sunday, A.D. 1549.

- „ 2nd „ A.D. 594.
- „ 3rd „ A.D. 594.
- „ 4th „ A.D. 594.
- „ 5th „ A.D. 594.

Sunday before Easter, A.D. 494.

Good Friday, A.D. 594.

- „ 2nd Collect, A.D. 494.
- „ 3rd Collect, A.D. 1549.

Easter even, A.D. 1661.

Easter day, A.D. 494.

Sunday after Easter, 1st, A.D. 1549.

- „ 2nd, A.D. 1549.
- „ 3rd, A.D. 451.
- „ 4th, A.D. 494.
- „ 5th, A.D. 494.

Ascension day, A.D. 594.

Sunday after Ascension, A.D. 1549.

Whitsunday, A.D. 594.

Trinity Sunday, A.D. 594.

Sunday after, 1st, A.D. 494.

- „ 2nd, A.D. 494. Altered in 1661..
- „ 3rd, A.D. 594.
- „ 4th, A.D. 594.
- „ 5th, A.D. 594.
- „ 6th, A.D. 494.
- „ 7th, A.D. 494.
- „ 8th, A.D. 494.
- „ 9th, A.D. 451.
- „ 10th, A.D. 451.
- „ 11th, A.D. 494.

Sunday after, 12th, A.D. 451.
 " 13th, A.D. 451.
 " 14th, A.D. 451.
 " 15th, A.D. 494.
 " 16th, A.D. 494.
 " 17th, A.D. 594.
 " 18th, A.D. 494.
 " 19th, A.D. 494.
 " 20th, A.D. 494.
 " 21st, A.D. 494.
 " 22nd, Anglo-Saxon *Sacra.* of Leofric.
 (See note above.)
 " 23rd, A.D. 594.
 " 24th, A.D. 594.
 " 25th, A.D. 594.
 St. Andrew's day, A.D. 1552.
 St. Thomas's, A.D. 1549.
 Conversion of St. Paul, A.D. 594. Altered in 1549.
 The Purification of St. Mary, A.D. 594.
 St. Mathias's, A.D. 1549.
 Annunciation of the Virgin, A.D. 594.
 St. Mark's day, A.D. 1549.
 St. Philip and St. James, A.D. 1549. Altered in 1661.
 St. Barnabas, A.D. 1549.
 St. John Baptist's, A.D. 1549.
 St. Peter's, A.D. 1549.
 St. James's, A.D. 1549.
 St. Bartholomew's, A.D. 594. Altered in 1549.
 St. Matthew's, A.D. 1549.
 St. Michael's, A.D. 594.
 St. Luke's, A.D. 1549. Altered in 1661.
 St. Simon and St. Jude, A.D. 1549.
 All Saints, A.D. 1549.

The above dates show that our Collects are generally derived either from ages *anterior to the Romish system*, or from the pen of our Reformers and Revisers, who did not hesitate to reject whatever was objectionable. Nicholls remarks: "We have undoubted authority that they were composed several hundred years before the

present Mass book had a being."—*Comment. on Prayer Book.* Lond., 1712.

As to the Epistles and Gospels, Comber refers to Augustine who says:—"We heard first the Apostolical lesson, then we sung a psalm, after that the Gospel was read." He quotes also from Chrysostom to the same purpose, showing that Epistles and Gospels were read in the service in their days ("Rationale," p. 86. Lond., 1684). The Epistles and Gospels are appropriate more or less to the day.

CHAPTER XV.

SECTION I.

THE COMMUNION SERVICE.

Authorship and Sources.—It has been often assumed that our Communion Service is derived from the Mass. This notion is due to the misconceptions of opponents of the Church, and of others. Thus, a work was published in 1679, entitled "An Answer out of the West to a Question out of the North," which contained the following passage:—"We have got, instead of the Gospel in the power and purity of it, a Service collected out of the *Romish books of the Mass, the Breviary, &c.*, which service our King James called an ill-sung Mass" ("Petyt Library," no. 1634. Skipton). Even the Commentary on the Prayer Book, lately published by the Christian Knowledge Society, contains the statement that "the Communion Service in the Prayer Book is based upon and translated from the Sarum use with considerable modifications and adaptations." This assertion, even with its qualifying remark, "considerable modifications and adaptations," is at variance with facts. The Communion Service is not a translation of

the Sarum use, but totally different from it. This will appear as we proceed.

Cranmer as to the Mass.—Cranmer took the lead in the revisions of 1549 and 1552 (*see* p. 29), and it is important, at the outset, to note his view of the Sarum office, and its opposition to the reformed Prayer Book. His opinion was called forth in a very remarkable manner on the occasion of the restoration of the Mass in the reign of Mary.

The Mass had been restored by Act of Parliament (1st Mary) which provided that “no other kind or order of Divine Service” should be allowed but such as was in use “in the last year of the reign of King Henry the Eighth” (Folio Ed. of Statutes of Record Commissioners). The Mass, therefore, which had been in use in the last year of the reign of Henry, namely, the Sarum office, now became legal. How did Cranmer view the change? Did he regard the restored service as essentially the same as the Reformed Communion office; and therefore as tolerable? The following facts supply an answer to the inquiry. It had been reported that he had acquiesced in the change, and said Mass in Canterbury! The Archbishop indignantly denied the imputation, and published a manifesto on the subject. This document was entitled:—

“A declaration of the Reverend Father in God, Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, condemning the untrue and slanderous report of some, which have reported, that he should set up the Mass at Canterbury, at the first coming of the Queen to her reign, 1553.”

It contains the following passage:—

“And as for offering myself to say mass before the Queen’s Highness, or in any other place, I never did, as her Grace knoweth well. But if her Grace will give me leave, I shall be ready to prove against all that will say to the contrary; and that the Communion book set forth by the most innocent and godly Prince, King Edward the VI, in his high Court of Parliament, is conformable to the order which our Saviour Christ did both observe and command to be observed, and which His Apostles and His primitive Church used many years: whereas the Mass in many things not only hath no foundation in Christ, His Apostles, nor the primitive Church, but also is manifest contrary to the same, *and containeth*

many horrible blasphemies in it."—*Memorials of Cranmer*, Strype, p. 437. Oxford, 1812.

This is a most decisive condemnation of the Sarum office, which had been restored by Act of Parliament in 1553, and which is identical in all essential points with the Roman use. And yet Mr. Gedge ventures to say that the Compilers of our service "took as *their model* the famous Salisbury use or Sarum office!"—*Companion to the Prayer Book*. Lond., 1880.

The same views were held by Ridley, Latimer, and the other Reformers. The works of Ridley, published by the Parker Society, contain a dialogue between him and Latimer on the very subject of the Sarum office. They refer to its leading points in strong terms of condemnation (*see Ridley's Works*, p. 104). Even in 1550, and under the book of 1549, Ridley had forbidden the assimilation of the Communion Service to the Mass. He issued injunctions from which we quote the following passage:—

"Item. That *no minister do counterfeit the Popish mass*, in kissing the Lord's board; washing his hands or fingers after the Gospel, or the receipt of the Holy Communion; shifting the book from one place to another; laying down and licking the chalice after the Communion; blessing his eyes with the sudarie thereof, or patten, or crossing his head with the same; holding his forefingers and thumbs joined together toward the temples of his head after the receiving of the Sacrament; breathing on the bread, or chalice; saying the agnus before the Communion; *showing the Sacrament openly before the distribution, or making any elevation thereof*; ringing of the sacrying bell; or setting any light upon the Lord's board. And finally, that the minister, in the time of the holy Communion, do use *only* the ceremonies and gestures appointed by the Book of Common Prayer, and *none other*, so that there do not appear in them any counterfeiting of the Popish Mass."—*Works*, p. 319. P.S.

Ridley, in prison in 1555, in his conference with

Latimer, says:—"The Mass itself I *utterly detest and abhor.*"—*Works*, p. 110.

He describes it as "stuffed with so many *absurdities, errors, and superstitions.*"—*Ibid.*, p. 130.

Latimer on the same occasion says:—"The very marrowbones of the Mass are *altogether detestable*, and therefore by no means to be borne withal, so that of necessity the mending of it is to *abolish it for ever.*"—*Ibid.*, 122.

These sentiments, and much more to the same effect, were expressed by the martyrs in the prospect of death.

Similar quotations might be given from the works of the Elizabethan Reformers.

We quote one from Bishop Pilkington, an Ecclesiastical Commissioner. Referring to the origin of the Service of the Mass, and its gradual growth, he says:—"For that consecration in Latin of theirs has many long other prayers, crossings, and blessings, and superstitious ceremonies."—*P. 498, Works. P.S.*

He describes it as "their *foolish Mass*" (p. 496, *Ibid.*), and "their *disordered order of massing.*"—*P. 497, Ibid.*

The Order of Communion.—We now proceed to refer to the Communion Service in detail.

The title—"The Order of administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion"—is derived from 1 Cor. xi. 20 and 1 Cor. x. 16. The word **Mass** was rejected by our Reformers on account of the association which it came to have with the mediæval doctrine of propitiatory sacrifice in the Lord's Supper. The word is derived from "*Ite, missa est*"—*Go, ye are dismissed*, pronounced by the Deacon at the close of the Ante-Communion Service to intimate that non-communicants were not to remain during the celebration of the Lord's Supper, which then followed. Jewel remarks:—"Of this departure away and proclamation, the action itself, which was the Holy Communion, was called *Missa.*"—*Controv. with Harding*, p. 641. P.S.

The first, second, and third rubrics relate to discipline,

and the exclusion of persons from the Lord's Supper. Dr. Stephens remarks that where "there has been no conviction in a court of record, and therefore, although the minister knows that the applicant will be an unworthy recipient, yet he is bound by the statute law to administer the holy Sacrament."—*The Prayer Book, with notes, in loco.*

This is a wise arrangement for the protection of the laity. The responsibility mainly rests upon the communicant. The Apostle says, "Let a man examine himself."—1 Cor. xi. 28.

The fourth rubric, in 1549, was that which we have quoted at p. 70, beginning "Upon the day," &c., relating to the vestments.

This was struck out in 1552, when the rubric as to ornaments was placed in its present position before "the order for Morning Prayer." The omission was supplied in 1552 by the following rubric, which is substantially the same as that now existing :—

"The table having at the Communion time a fair white linen cloth upon it, shall stand in the body of the church, or in the chancel, where Morning Prayer and Evening Prayer be appointed to be said. And the priest, standing at the north side of the table, shall say the Lord's Prayer, with this collect following."

An attempt was made in 1661 to alter the rubric so as to fix the table in the chancel. It was proposed to substitute "in the most convenient place in the upper end of the chancel, or of the body of the church, where there is no chancel." The proposal was at first accepted, but ultimately rejected.

The following rubric, the fifth in order, immediately preceded the Lord's Prayer in 1549:—"The priest standing humbly afore the midst of the Altar shall say the Lord's Prayer, with this collect."

The word Altar was struck out of the Prayer Book in 1552, and never restored. There are several instances of this in the Communion Service.

Book of 1549.

Book as it is.

... "The midst of the Altar."—*Fifth rubric.*

"The north side of the Table."

“And setting both the bread and wine upon the Altar.” — *Fourth rubric after offertory sentences.*

“Then the priest, turning him to the Altar, shall say or sing.” — *Rubric before prayer of Consecration.*

“Turning still to the Altar.” — *Prayer of Consecration.*

The Lord’s Prayer opens the service.

Dr. Stephens remarks :—

“In most churches, whether collegiate or parochial, the people or choir do not audibly join the priest till the Amen; *which is not in accordance with the rubrics.*”—*Notes, in loco.*

The Collect for Purity following has been traced to the Liturgy of Leofric in the 9th century.

The Ten Commandments, with the responses, had no place in the Mass. The service of Pollanus probably suggested the introduction of the Commandments to our Reformers.

The Collects for the Monarch were composed in 1549. We have referred already to the Creed.—See p. 91.

A rubric was inserted in the book of 1552, requiring the curate to “declare unto the people whether there be any holy days or fasting days the week following.” This was intended to prevent the observance of Romish days. He was also to exhort them to “remember the poor.”

Of the three rubrics now existing, the first retains notice of holidays, and adds that “then also (if occasion be) shall notice be given of the Communion; and briefs, citations, banns of marriage and excommunications read.” — *Sealed Books.*

“And when there is a Communion, the Priest shall then place upon the Table so much Bread and Wine as he shall think sufficient.”

“When the Priest standing before the Table hath so ordered the Bread and Wine.”

Omitted.

The second states that "the sermon or one of the Homilies" is to follow.

The third directs the priest to "return to the Lord's table, and begin the Offertory, saying one or more of the sentences." The direction to return to the Lord's table was introduced in 1661.

The words "banns of marriage" occur in the sealed books, but have been omitted without due authority in the various recent editions of the Prayer Book, in consequence of a mistaken view of the following passage in Lord Hardwicke's Act, 26 Geo. II, c. 33, directing that the banns shall be "published upon three Sundays preceding the solemnization of marriage during the time of Morning Service, or of the Evening Service, if there be no Morning Service, in such church or chapel on any of those Sundays, immediately after the second lesson."

The printers ventured to alter the rubric to its present form. Dr. A. J. Stephens says that they "have chosen to make the words in the section, 'after the second lesson,' override the whole sentence, so as to apply to the Morning Service as well as the Evening."

He thinks that

"The object of the legislature was to provide for the publication of banns during Evening Service in churches where there happened to be no Morning Service." . . . "The rules of law require that the two statutes (the 13th of Charles II and the 26th of George II) should be construed together, and that they should be so construed as, if possible, to give full effect to each."—See Notes, as before.

Alms and Oblations.—The word *offertory* was inserted in 1662. It denotes the sentences, and relates to the *offerings*.

The rubrical directions that "the alms for poor and other devotions of the people" collected "in a decent basin" shall be "reverently" brought to the priest, "who shall humbly present and place it upon the holy table," and that "when there is a Communion, the

priest shall then place upon the table so much bread and wine as he shall think sufficient," were inserted in 1661. Then also the word "oblations" was added to the word "alms."

White and Riddle give "*an offering*" as the first meaning of the word "oblation" (Lexicon). The book of 1549 directed the sentences to be read while the people are "*offering*" their money contributions. This obvious meaning of the word "oblation" was well understood. Thus the injunctions of 1547 provide a chest to the intent that parishioners should put into it "their *oblation* and *alms* for their poor neighbours," designating them as "oblation and alms," and adding, "the which *alms* and *devotion*" of the people shall at convenient times be taken out of the chest. The words "oblation and alms" and "alms and devotion" are thus applied to the offerings for the poor.

The Prayer Book of 1637, prepared under the direction of Laud, and introduced into Scotland on the authority of the Crown, directs the deacon, "or one of the churchwardens," to "receive the devotions of the people there present in a *bason* provided for the purpose." And it adds "when all have *offered* he shall reverently bring the said *bason*, *with the oblations therein*, and deliver it to the presbyter, who shall humbly present it before the Lord, and set it upon the holy table." Here the word "oblations" is applied to the money offerings. The rubric further directs "the presbyter to offer up and place the bread and wine" "upon the Lord's Table," as an act separate from the presentation of "the oblation." As we shall see, it was proposed in 1661 that the priest should "offer up" "the bread and wine," but the proposal was rejected. It appears from the photozincographed Prayer Book that the words "offer up" were actually inserted, but subsequently struck out.

There are several reasons for which the word "oblations" cannot refer to the bread and wine. We give two:—

1. The rubric directs that “if there be no alms, or oblations,” the words “our alms *and* oblations be left out *unsaid*.” There are cases, though rare, in which alms are not offered in the public administration of the Lord’s Supper. If the Church had meant that the bread and wine are the oblations, she would have directed that, in such a case, the word “alms” should be left out, and the word “oblations” said. Some clergymen venture to omit the word “oblations” when there is no communion, but they plainly disobey the rubric. Dr. Howson, the learned Dean of Chester, puts this point with great force when he says:—“Under no circumstance is it allowable to alter the collective phrase, ‘alms and oblations,’ which is prescribed.” He adds, “to put the matter briefly, the priest in receiving the offerings of the people has no more right to bisect the formula than he has to break the basin in which the offerings are reverently brought and humbly presented.”—*The Churchman*, January, 1852, p. 264.

2. It was proposed in the revision of 1662 to insert the words “offer up” in the rubric relating to the placing of the bread and wine on the table, but the proposal was ultimately REJECTED. Dean Howson remarks:—“The proposal for inserting the expression ‘offer up’ had been considered and refused. And if it was not permissible to use this expression, then it cannot have been intended that the placing of the unconsecrated bread and wine was intended to be an ‘oblation.’ If they were not an offering they were not an oblation. Let it be remembered, too, that what we have to do with here is not a mere casual rule, but a rubric adopted after serious debate and careful thought. The present rule embodies the deliberate rejection of a proposal that the placing of the bread and wine should be made an oblation.”—*Ibid.*

The rubrical direction that the minister shall place the bread and wine on the table was suggested by a similar arrangement in Baxter’s Prayer Book presented at the Savoy Conference (see p. 66). The suggestion

was adopted by Convocation at the end of 1661, when also the word "oblations" was added to the word "alms," with the rubrical direction that the priest shall place "the decent bason" containing the alms "upon the holy table." But we note that the proposal to "offer up" the elements made by Sancroft was rejected. Sancroft acquiesced, as it appears from his visitation articles in 1686, in which he inquired whether "the alms and oblations" were duly "collected" and "disposed to pious and charitable uses," thus applying the words "alms and oblations" to money offerings.

The addition of the word "oblations" to "alms," was important as giving a more distinctively religious character to the offerings.

Exhortations and other portions. — Of the four exhortations which follow, the first was composed for the "Order of Communion" in 1548, and incorporated in the book of 1549. The second was composed by Peter Martyr, and inserted in the Prayer Book of 1552. The third exhortation was composed for the "Order of Communion," and incorporated in the book of 1549. The fourth, "Ye that do truly," &c., with *the Confession*, has the same history.

The Absolution, in the "Order of Communion," opened as follows:—"Our blessed Lord who hath left power to his Church to absolve penitent sinners from their sins, and to restore to the grace of the heavenly Father such as truly believe in Christ." (Conclusion as at present.)

It was changed to its present form in 1549.

The sentences of Scripture, or "comfortable words," were introduced into "the Order of Communion" in 1548, and incorporated in the book of 1549, the idea being borrowed from Hermann's Reformed Liturgy.

The *Sursum Corda*, "lift up your hearts," is referred to by Cyprian in the 3rd century.

The Preface for Christmas was composed in 1549; that for Easter is in the liturgy of Gelasius; that for

Ascension is attributed to Gregory the Great; that for Whitsunday was composed in 1549; and that for Trinity Sunday is in the liturgy of Gelasius.

The *Ter Sanctus* ("holy, holy, holy") is founded upon Isaiah vi.; its use in the Christian Church is immemorial.

The prayer of "humble access," "we do not presume," was composed for "the Order of Communion" in 1548, and incorporated in the book of 1549.

Position of the Celebrant.—The following rubric was inserted in 1661:—

When the priest, standing before the table, hath so ordered the bread and wine, *that he may with the more readiness and decency break the bread before the people*, and take the cup into his hands, he shall say the prayer of consecration, as followeth.

The rubric as it stood before was as follows:—"And the priest standing up shall say, as followeth." The introduction of the manual acts, which was suggested by the Puritans, rendered it necessary to give some direction as to the ordering, or arranging, of the elements for consecration. The normal position of the Celebrant is at the north of the Table, but, by the rubric requiring the manual acts, he is set free from that position to give him an opportunity of ordering the Elements, which may be beyond his reach from the north side. Celebrants know by experience the necessity of obviating this difficulty, and the indecency of stretching over the Table. But it was desirable to provide for this exceptional change of position by a rubric to protect the minister from a charge of standing with his back to the people,* when necessity requires him so to do during the ordering of the Elements.

The rubric expressly states that the priest is to do this "*that he may with the more readiness and decency break the bread before the people*." The point at which the rubric aims is the visibility to the people of the manual acts, which is altogether adverse to the Romish

* Such a charge had been brought against Bishop Wren.

custom, observed by the priest, of standing with his back to the people during the prayer of consecration.

The judges in the Ridsdale case truly remark:—“Their Lordships are of opinion that the words ‘before the people,’ coupled with the direction as to the manual acts, are meant to be equivalent to ‘*in the sight of the people.*’ They have no doubt that the rubric requires the manual acts to be so done, that in a reasonable and practical sense, the communicants, especially if they are conveniently placed for receiving of the Holy Sacrament, as is presumed in the office, may be witnesses of, that is, may see them.”

The same judgment does not fix any position for the saying of the prayer of consecration, but rules that the celebrant must “stand, so that he may, *in good faith*, enable the communicants present, or the bulk of them, being properly placed, to see, if they wish it, the breaking of the bread and the performance of the other manual acts mentioned.” Their lordships add that the position of the minister at the north side of the table, “is not only lawful, but is that which, under ordinary circumstances, would enable the minister with the greatest certainty and convenience to fulfil the requirements of the rubrics.”

There is no doubt whatever that what is called the Eastward position is at variance with the long established custom of the Church of England. Bishop Wordsworth (of St. Andrew's) expresses his opinion that the Purchas judgment is right, and says:—“And among other reasons for thinking so, the following appears to me unanswerable—I assume the practice of our twenty-four English Cathedrals as giving us the surest rule, because the practice being not of an individual but of a corporation, is least liable to change. Now it is certain that *before* the Reformation the Eastward position was the invariable use in them all; and it is no less certain that *since* the Reformation the use of the north end position has been in them equally *universal*, and is so still, except that of late years in three or four

Cathedrals the Eastward position has been partially introduced."—*Letter to Mr. B. Hope, June 4th, 1874.*

L'Estrange, one of our oldest Liturgiologists, remarks:—"As for the priest standing at the north side of the table, this seemeth to avoid the fashion of the priest standing with his face towards the east, as is the Popish practice.' So the Collections of a learned man."—*Alliance of Offices, A.D. 1659.*

The Eastward position is not primitive nor Catholic. On the whole subject, see Dean Howson's "Before the Table," Macmillan, 1875, and Dr. Harrisson's work, "The Eastward position, unscriptural, not primitive, not Catholic?" Longmans, 1876.

The Prayer of Consecration was modified from the second part of that prayer as it existed in 1549. The manual acts, directing the breaking of bread, &c., were omitted in 1552, but restored in 1661, at the suggestion of the Puritans who, amongst their written exceptions, stated as follows in reference to the prayer of consecration:—"We conceive that the *manner* of the consecrating of the elements is not here explicit and distinct enough, and the ministers' *breaking of the bread* is not so much as mentioned." — *Cardwell's Conf.*, p. 321. Oxford, 1841.

**The Canon of the Mass,
The Consecration Prayer of 1549, and the Consecration
Prayer as it is, contrasted.**

We now give, 1st, a quotation from the Canon of the Mass containing the form of consecration; 2nd, The Prayer of Consecration from the book of 1549; and 3rd, that prayer from the book as it is. The reader will at once perceive the nature of the change effected at the Reformation, and the vast difference which exists between the forms of consecration.

After "the Preface" of the Mass, which is the introductory portion, consisting of numerous prayers and ceremonies, the *Canon* follows, so called, as the *rule* which is to be rigidly observed.

The Canon begins with the words "Te igitur," and concludes with the "Pater Noster." After prayer for the Church, prayers for the living and the dead, the Canon proceeds as follows:—

(We give the translation published by the Rev. J. T. Carter, Rector of Clewer.)

Canon of the Mass.

"Here the priest regards the Host with great veneration saying,*

"We beseech Thee, therefore, O Lord, graciously to accept this oblation of our service and of Thy whole family; dispose our days in Thy peace, preserve us from everlasting damnation, and number us among Thine elect. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

"Here he again regards the Host, saying,

"Which oblation do Thou, Almighty God, vouchsafe in all respects (here he makes three signs of the Cross over each, saying) to + bless, ap+prove, ra+tify, and accept, that it may be to us (here he makes a cross over the bread) the + Body (and here over the chalice) and + Blood (then he joins his hands continuing) of Thy most well-beloved Son Jesus Christ our Lord.

"Here the priest raises his hands and again joins them; afterwards he wipes his fingers, and then elevates the Host, saying,

"Who the night before He suffered took bread into His Holy and Venerable Hands, and lifting up His eyes to heaven (here he lifts up his eyes) to Thee, O God, His Almighty Father (here he bows himself, and then raises himself somewhat, saying), and when He had given thanks to Thee, He blessed it and brake (here he touches the host), and gave it to His disciples, saying, Take and eat ye all of it. For this is My Body.

"And these words of consecration are to be said with a single breath, without any pause between them. After these words the priest inclines to the Host, and then elevates

* The Host not yet consecrated.

it above his forehead, so that it can be seen by the people, and then reverently replaces it before the chalice in the manner of a cross. Then he uncovers the chalice and holds it with both hands, not disjoining his thumb and forefinger, only when he makes the sign of the cross, thus saying,

“ Likewise after supper He took also this most excellent chalice into His holy and venerable hands, and having (here he inclines) given thanks to Thee, He + blessed it, and gave it to His disciples saying, Take and drink ye all of it (*here he elevates the chalice, continuing*), for this is the chalice of my blood of the new and everlasting Testament, the mystery of faith, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins (*here he elevates the chalice to his breast, or above his head, saying*), This do as oft as ye shall do it, for a memorial of me.

“ *Here he replaces the chalice, and rubs his fingers over it, on account of any fragment [of the Host] : and covers the chalice. Then he raises his arms after the manner of a cross, his fingers being joined together, till he comes to the words, Thy gifts bestowed upon us.*

“ Wherefore, O Lord, we, Thy servants, as also Thy holy people, being mindful of the blessed passion of this Christ, Thy son, our Lord and God ; and of His resurrection from the dead, and of His glorious ascension into heaven, offer unto Thy most excellent Majesty of Thy gifts bestowed upon us (*here he makes five crosses, the first three over both Host and chalice, saying*), a pure + Host, an Ho+ly Host, a Host + immaculate (*the fourth over the bread, saying*), the Holy bread of eternal life (*the fifth over the chalice, saying*), and the chalice of everlasting salvation. Upon which do Thou vouchsafe to look with propitious and serene countenance,* and to accept them as Thou wert pleased to accept the gifts of Thy righteous servant Abel, and the sacrifice of the patriarch Abraham, and that which

* See remarks of Ridley and Latimer on this, p. 22.

Thy High Priest Melchisedech offered to Thee, a holy sacrifice, a spotless victim.

“Here the priest, bowing down his body, and crossing his fingers, says,

“We most humbly beseech Thee, Almighty God, command these things to be carried by the hand of Thy Holy Angel to Thy Altar on high, in sight of Thy Divine Majesty, that as many (*here raising himself he kisses the altar to the right of the sacrifice, saying*), as shall partake at this altar of the most sacred body (*here he makes the sign of the cross over the Host*) and blood (*and here over the chalice*) of Thy Son may be filled (*here he signs himself on the face*) with all heavenly grace and blessing. Through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.”

After prayers for the dead, the following rubric occurs :—

“Here the priest uncovers the chalice, and makes the sign of the cross with the Host five times, once beyond the chalice on either side, once even with the chalice, once below the chalice, fourthly as at first, and fifthly in front of the chalice, the Deacon, meanwhile, having washed his hands, ministering to him on his right with a corporal.

“By + whom, and with + whom, and in + whom, be unto thee God the Father Al+mighty, in unity of the Holy + Ghost, all honour and glory :

“Having said these prayers in a low voice, the priest covers again the chalice, and resting his hands on the altar, sings aloud,

“World without end,

“The choir responding. Amen.”

As to the origin and authorship of the Canon of the Mass, see supplement to chap. xv.

Prayer of Consecration of the Book of 1549 (numbered 1, 2, 3, to indicate its division into separate prayers in 1552).

(1) “Almighty and everliving God, which by thy holy Apostle hast taught us to make prayers and supplications, and to give thanks for all men: We

humbly beseech thee most mercifully to receive these our prayers, which we offer unto thy divine Majesty, beseeching thee to inspire continually the universal Church with the spirit of truth, unity, and concord: And grant that all they that do confess thy holy name, may agree in the truth of thy holy Word, and live in unity and godly love. Specially we beseech thee to save and defend thy servant Edward our King, that under him we may be Godly and quietly governed. And grant unto his whole council, and to all that be put in authority under him, that they may truly and indifferently administer justice, to the punishment of wickedness and vice, and to the maintenance of God's true religion and virtue. Give grace (O heavenly Father) to all Bishops, Pastors, and Curates, that they may both by their life and doctrine set forth thy true and lively Word, and rightly and duly administer thy holy Sacraments: and to all thy people give thy heavenly grace, that with meek heart and due reverence they may hear and receive thy holy Word, truly serving thee in holiness and righteousness all the days of their life. And we most humbly beseech thee of thy goodness (O Lord) to comfort and succour all them, which in this transitory life be in trouble, sorrow, need, sickness, or any other adversity. And especially we commend unto thy merciful goodness this congregation which is here assembled in thy name, to celebrate the commemoration of the most glorious death of thy Son: And we here do give unto thee most high praise, and hearty thanks, for the wonderful grace and virtue, declared in all thy saints, from the beginning of the world: And chiefly in the glorious and most blessed Virgin Mary, mother of thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord and God, and in the holy Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, and Martyrs, whose examples (O Lord) and stedfastness in thy faith, and keeping thy holy commandments, grant us to follow. *We commend unto thy mercy (O Lord) all other thy servants, which are departed hence from us, with the sign of faith, and now do rest in*

the sleep of peace : Grant unto them, we beseech thee, thy mercy and everlasting peace, and that, at the day of the general resurrection, we and all they which be of the mystical body of thy Son, may altogether be set on his right hand, and hear that his most joyful voice : Come unto me, O ye that be blessed of my Father, and possess the kingdom, which is prepared for you from the beginning of the world : Grant this, O Father, for Jesus Christ's sake, our only Mediator and Advocate.

(2) “O God heavenly Father, which of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption, who made there (by his one oblation, once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, and did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to celebrate, a perpetual memory of that his precious death, until his coming again : Hear us (O merciful Father) we beseech thee : *and with thy Holy Spirit and word vouchsafe to bl+ess and sanctify these thy gifts, and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ.* [Here the priest must take the bread into his hands.] Who in the same night that he was betrayed, took bread, and when he had blessed, and given thanks, he brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying : Take eat, this is my body which is given for you : do this in remembrance of me.

“ Likewise after supper he took the cup [*here the priest shall take the cup into his hands*], and when he had given thanks he gave it to them, saying : Drink ye all of this, for this is my blood of the new Testament, which is shed for you and for many, for remission of sins : Do this, as oft as you shall drink it, in remembrance of me.

“ *These words before rehearsed are to be said, turning still to the Altar, without any elevation, or showing the Sacrament to the people.*

(3) "Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the Institution of thy dearly beloved Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, *we thy humble servants do celebrate, and make here before thy divine Majesty, with these thy holy gifts, the memorial which thy Son hath willed us to make*: having in remembrance his blessed passion, mighty resurrection, and glorious ascension, rendering unto thee most hearty thanks, for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same, entirely desiring thy fatherly goodness, mercifully to accept this our Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving: most humbly beseeching thee to grant, that by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion. And here we offer and present unto thee (O Lord) ourself, our souls, and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto thee: humbly beseeching thee, that whosoever shall be partakers of this holy Communion, may worthily receive the most precious body and blood of thy Son Jesus Christ, and be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction, and made one body with thy Son Jesus Christ, that he may dwell in them, and they in him. And although we be unworthy (through our manifold sins) to offer unto thee any Sacrifice: Yet we beseech to accept this our bounden duty and service, *and command these our prayers and supplications, by the ministry of thy holy Angels, to be brought up into thy holy Tabernacle before the sight of thy divine Majesty*; not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences, through Christ our Lord; by whom, and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto thee, O Father Almighty, world without end. Amen."

Prayer of Consecration as it is, A.D. 1662.—
 "Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ, to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption, who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered)

a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, and did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that his precious death, until his coming again ; hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee : and grant that we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood : Who, in the

(a) Here the Priest same night that he was betrayed (a) took is to take the Paten into his hands: bread, and when he had given thanks, (b)

(b) And here to he brake it, and gave it to his disciples, break the bread:

(c) And here to saying: Take, eat, (c) this is my body lay his hand upon which is given for you : Do this in remembrance of me.

(d) Here he is to membrance of me. Likewise after supper take the cup into his hand: (d) he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all

(e) And here to of this, for this (e) is my blood of the lay his hand upon New Testament, which is shed for you every vessel (be it Chalice or Flagon) and for many for the remission of sins: in which there is any wine to be consecrated. Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me. Amen."

Points of difference between the prayer of Consecration of 1549, and the prayer as it is.—In the book of 1552 and in the Prayer Book as it is, this prayer not only appears without its objectionable features but is divided into three parts, (1) the prayer for "the whole estate of Christ's Church militant here on earth;" (2) "the Prayer of Consecration;" and (3) the prayer of the oblation of ourselves, which is said after the Lord's Prayer succeeding communion. If the reader will compare the Prayer of Consecration as it stood in the book of 1549, with the three prayers into which it has been broken, as they now stand in our Prayer Book, and which are completely detached from one another, he will at once see the greatness of the changes effected in 1552, when that prayer, minus the manual acts, assumed its present form.

The *prayer for the dead* in prayer No. 1, indicated by the italics, has been obliterated.

The *invocation of the Holy Ghost on the elements* in prayer No. 2, indicated by the italics, has been obliterated: and the prayer that the elements “may be unto us the body and blood” of Christ were changed to the present form.

The *presentation of the consecrated elements* in prayer No. 3, indicated by the italics, has been obliterated.

Moreover the prayer of oblation of ourselves (“here we offer and present unto thee”) was placed *after Communion*, in which position it cannot refer to the consecrated elements now consumed.

Thus our prayer of consecration, composed by our Reformers, except in the quotation of the words of institution, is in all respects different from the Canon of the Mass. The mending of the Mass was, as Latimer says, “TO ABOLISH IT FOR EVER.”—See p. 112.

Succeeding rubrics and prayers.—The rubric directs the minister to deliver the Communion in both kinds to the people “into their hands.” In the Romish service the wafer is placed on the tongue, and the cup not given to the laity.

The words of delivery combine two forms in both kinds, the first as used in the book of 1549, and the other as used in the book of 1552.

The Puritan Directory of 1644 provided the following address:—“Take ye; eat ye; this is the body of Christ,” with a like address in the delivery of the cup. This is a stronger form than that in our Service.

The rubric directing the consecrated elements which remain to be covered with “a fair linen cloth,” was added in 1661, but the revisers avoided the expression “corporal,” which exists in the Scottish liturgy.

The Lord’s Prayer, “in which,” as Comber remarks, “we profess ourselves sons of the same Father,” occurs appropriately after reception.

Two thanksgivings follow, one of which is to be used at the discretion of the minister.

The first was modified from the third part of the prayer of consecration in the book of 1549, and contains the oblation of “*ourselves*” in dedication to God. As a prayer of oblation it cannot refer, in its present position, to the bread and wine which have been received. Dean Goulburn remarks, “Is it not the presentation of the Christian’s reasonable service—the oblation of himself, ‘his soul and body,’ to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto God? This oblation is, indeed, in no sense (like that of Christ) propitiatory.”—*On the Com. Office*, p. 324.

The alternative prayer was composed in 1549; it breathes the spirit of joyful thanksgiving.

“*The Glory in excelsis*” has been traced to the 4th century, but it existed no doubt at an earlier period. In the book of 1549 it occurred in the commencement of the service. It was placed in its present position in 1552. It is founded upon Luke ii. 14, and called “the Angelic Hymn.”

The first part of the benediction was composed for “the Order of Communion” in 1548; the latter part was added in 1549.

Of the six collects which follow, three were composed in 1549 (the third, fifth, and sixth), two (second and fourth) exist in the Liturgy of Gregory, A.D. 594, and the first is in the Liturgy of Galasius, A.D. 494.

Of the following rubrics, the first was inserted in 1552.

The second and third rubrics are prohibitory of private Communion, or Mass, as it was called. The book of 1552 requires “a good number;” the rubric, as it is, requires “a convenient number,” “four or three at the least,” to “communicate with the Priest.”

The fourth rubric requires the Communion every Sunday at the least, “in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches and Colleges,” “where there are many Priests and Deacons” “except they have a reasonable cause to the contrary.”

Wafer Bread.—The fifth rubric was composed in 1552. The rubric, in 1549, had been as follows:—

“ For avoiding of all matters and occasion of dissension, it is meet that the bread prepared for the communion be made, through all this realm, after one sort and fashion ; that is to say, unleavened, and round, as it was afore, but without all manner of print, and something more larger and thicker than it was, so that it may be aptly divided into divers pieces : and every one shall be divided into two pieces, at the least, or more, by the discretion of the minister, and so distributed. And men must not think less to be received in part than in the whole, but in each of them the whole body of our Saviour Jesu Christ.”

This was replaced in 1552 by the following :—

“ And to take away the superstition, which any person hath, or might have in the bread and wine, it shall suffice that the bread be such as is usual to be eaten at the table with other meats, but the best and purest wheat bread that conveniently may be gotten. And if any of the bread or wine remain, the curate shall have it to his own use.”

But diversity of practice arose in the reign of Elizabeth, whose injunctions of 1559 directed that the sacramental bread “ be made and formed plain, without any figure thereupon, of the same fineness and fashion round, though somewhat bigger in compasse and thicknesse, as the usual bread and wafer, heretofore named singing cakes which served for the use of the private Mass.”—*Sparrow's Collect*, p. 83.

Some adhered to the rubric, while others obeyed the injunction. The use of wafer bread gradually declined. Even in 1570 Parker says to Cecil, “ I hear also that in the Court you be come to usual bread.”

Bishop Overton, in 1584, in his visitation articles, made the following inquiry :—

“ Item, that the ordinance of the Book of Common Prayer be from henceforth observed in this, that the bread delivered to the communicants be such as is *usual to be eaten at the table with other meats . . . and no other bread* to be used by the minister, nor to be provided for by the churchwardens and parishioners than such finest common bread.”

In 1604 the 20th Canon directed the use of “ fine wheat bread.”

The rubric of 1552 (above) was retained in 1662, when the words were added, “ all occasion of dissension,” fixing a rule.

The rubric, as modified in 1661, sanctioned by statute, must be regarded as the final settlement, overruling, in this particular, the injunctions of 1559.

The words "it shall suffice," are mandatory and exclusive. Thus the 25th Canon states, "it shall be sufficient to wear surplices," the title of the canon being as follows:—"Surplices and hoods to be worn in cathedral churches when there is no Communion." The question has been definitely settled by the Final Court of Appeal, in the case of Mr. Ridsdale, as follows:—

"The practice of using fine wheat bread such as is usual to be eaten, and not cake or wafer, appears to have been universal throughout the Church of England from the alteration of the rubric in 1662 till 1840 or later. Their Lordships think that if it had been averred and proved that wafer-bread, properly so-called, had been used by the appellant, it would have been illegal, but as the averment and proof is insufficient they will advise an alteration of the decree in this respect."

The sixth rubric was introduced in 1552, and forbids the reservation of the consecrated elements which was allowed by the book of 1549. It requires the priest and "such other of the communicants as he shall then call unto him," immediately after the blessing, to "reverently eat and drink the same."

The seventh rubric, introduced in 1552, directs that "the bread and wine shall be provided by the curate and churchwardens at the charges of the parish." This is hardly consistent with the opinion that the bread and wine are the oblations mentioned in the prayer for the Church Militant, "We humbly beseech thee most mercifully to accept our alms and oblations," the free will offerings of the *worshippers*.

The eighth rubric, introduced in 1552, modified in 1661, requires parishioners to receive "at the least three times in the year, of which Easter to be one," and to pay the Easter dues. Bishop Stillingfleet supposes the dues to be a composition for personal tithes.—See Stephen's Prayer Book, with notes, *ut supra*.

The ninth rubric places the offertory at the disposal of "the minister and churchwardens," for "such pious

and charitable uses" as they shall "think fit," with the right of appeal to the ordinary. This rule does not apply to collections made without the offertory.

SECTION II.

THE DECLARATION ON KNEELING.

The following important declaration ought to be specially noted :—

"Whereas it is ordained in this Office for the Administration of the Lord's Supper that the Communicants should receive the same kneeling; (which order is well meant, for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy Receivers, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder in the holy Communion, as otherwise might ensue;) yet, lest the same kneeling should by any persons, either out of ignorance and infirmity, or out of malice and obstinacy, be misconstrued and depraved; it is here declared, That thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received, or unto any Corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood. For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored; (for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;) and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be at one time in more places than one."

The declaration on Kneeling, sometimes called the "black rubric," was added to the Prayer Book on the 27th of October, 1552, by order of Council. John Knox and many earnest Protestants were jealous lest the posture of kneeling should be "misconstrued" as an act of adoration either to the consecrated elements, or the

supposed presence in the elements, and, to satisfy their scruples, the declaration was added on the authority of the Crown.

That it was framed upon the twenty-ninth of the forty-two Articles appears from a comparison of the two documents, and is admitted by Mr. Perry, who says:—“This comparison of the Article and the Declaration seems to leave no reasonable doubt whence the language was derived of this explanation of the Rubric on Kneeling, which the Archbishop and his co-advisers deemed it desirable to publish.”—*Declaration on Kneeling*, p. 118. Lond., 1863.

The Commentary of the S.P.C.K. states that the declaration “was intended as a protest against a certain low and gross notion of a carnal presence *then* prevalent.” This statement, however, is not borne out by facts. In order to ascertain the doctrine and practice which it repudiates, we have only to consider the opinions which were held by the Mediævalists in 1552, when the declaration was first published.

Gardiner was the champion of the Mediæval doctrine, and Cranmer, as Waterland says, was the “*instar omnium*,” the representative of the Reformers.

Gardiner gives his views as follows:—

“I will make the issue with this author that *no Catholic teaching* is so framed as though we should eat Christ’s most precious body grossly, carnally, joining those words so together. For else carnally alone may have a good signification as Hilary useth it, but contrariwise speaking in the *Catholic teaching* of the manner of Christ’s presence, they call it a *spiritual manner of presence*.”—*Cranmer’s Lord’s Supper*, p. 112. P.S.

Gardiner, while repudiating a gross and carnal presence, adds that “yet there is present by God’s power the very true natural body and blood of Christ, whole God and man, without leaving his place in Heaven.” Gardiner and the Mediævalists hold, as the Tridentine Council teaches, that Christ is present “not locally, nor by manner of quantity” (p. 89, as before), but that “the manner of Christ’s presence in the Sacrament is *spiritual*” (p. 155 as before). They teach the

corporal presence but not the corporal *manner* of presence.

The reason of these distinctions is obvious. The senses declare that the bread which is supposed to contain the body and blood of Christ has not the quantity, nor the taste, and does not occupy the space of a human body. To meet this fact, the advocates of a literal presence are driven to the above subterfuge of a *superlocal* and *supernatural manner* of presence. The Council of Trent and others teach that the body and blood of Christ are not in the elements “*as*” in Heaven. So Gardiner contended for two manners of presence—the one as in Heaven, the other as in the elements—the body in Heaven in one condition, the other on earth in another condition.

Cranmer replies :—

“For that were to make two natures of one body and to divide the body of Jesus, forasmuch as one nature cannot at one time be both with us and absent from us.”—*Lord’s Supper*, p. 94. P.S.

The position taken by the Reformers and their opponents appears in every controversy of the time.

Hooper on the words “*me ye have not always*” (Matt. xxvi. 11), alludes to the gloss of his opponents, whom he calls Neoterics :—

“Christ did not say, *me you will have in an invisible, supernatural and heavenly, but not corporal, or local manner*, as the Neoterici say, but he said simply, and openly of his body, ‘*me ye will not have*’—that is, *me*, as far as it pertains to *the presence of my human body, ye will not have*’”—*Later Writings*, p. 445. P.S.

Harding says that the body of Christ is present :—

“*Not after a gross or carnal manner*, but spiritually and supernaturally yet substantially, *not by local but by substantial presence*.”—*Jewel’s Works and Sermons, and Harding*, p. 480. P.S.

Jewel reduces Harding’s arguments to an absurdity :—

“Over all this M. Harding throweth a sweet mist to carry away the simple in the dark. Christ’s body, saith he, is in the sacrament not by local, but by substantial presence; carnally but not in a carnal *manner*; placed in the pix, in the hand, in the mouth, and yet in *no place* at all; a very natural body even as it was on the cross, yet without all *manner of quantity and dimensions or proportions* of a body, that is neither thick, nor broad, nor short, nor long; there now where before it was not, and yet without any

shifting or change of places. Unless this man were fast asleep, he could never fall into so deep a dream. In these phantasies he seemeth well to agree with the old heretics, Eutyches and Manichee.”—*Controv. with Harding*, p. 483.

Jewel further says:—

“M. Harding, to maintain his errors and to avoid infinite absurdities, is driven to say: there are two Christs; the one local, the other not local; the one above, the other beneath; the one with proportion of body, the other without proportion.”—*Ibid.*

Jewel does not mean that Harding openly professed his belief in the existence of two bodies, but says:—

“Howbeit he seemeth to publish this principle *unawares* against himself. For if Christ’s body in the Sacrament be not local, as he saith, then it is no natural or *real* body.”—*Ibid.*

The Reformers were *in full possession* of these subtleties when they drew up the declaration which sets forth that:—

“No adoration is intended or ought to be done unto *any corporal presence* of Christ’s natural flesh and blood the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven and not here; it being against the truth of Christ’s natural body to be at one time in more places than one.”

The word *corporal* (from *corpus, body*) implies a presence *in body*. This appears everywhere in the works of the Reformers. One example will suffice. Cranmer’s words are:—

“Although he be absent hence bodily.”—P. 167. P.S.

This is rendered in the Latin:—

“Quamquam *corpore absens* sit.”

But why the expression “any corporal presence of Christ’s natural flesh and blood?” Is it not tautological to say “corporal presence of a body?” We answer no; for there are other modes of presence of Christ’s body—(1) *the figurative in the elements*, (2) *the virtual in grace*, and (3) *the mystical body*, the Church. The Reformers held a *virtual* presence of Christ’s natural flesh and blood to the worthy recipient, but rejected “any corporal presence of Christ’s natural flesh and blood.”

The expression of “corporal presence” was in common use among the Reformers. Cramner says:—

“Your *corporal presence of Christ’s body*.”—P. 255, *ut supra*.

Hooper has the words :—

“Corporalem præsentiam mei corporis.”—*Later Writings*, p. 451. P.S.

Again :—

“Corporalem corporis Christi presentiam.”—P. 490.*

The opposition between *corporal* and *virtual* presence of Christ’s body, or flesh and blood, appears very clearly.

Hooper says :—

“For in all ages from the beginning of the world, to those who looked for him with true faith, Christ was efficaciously (although not bodily) always present, though *not according to the presence of his human body, yet according to the grace of his body*.—P. 478, *ut supra*.

Here the presence of His human body is opposed to the presence of the grace of His body.

The rubrical reason assigned for non-adoration is that,—

“The natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven and not here; it being against the *truth* of Christ’s natural body to be at one time in more places than one.”

Cranmer says :—

“For the nature and property of a very body is to be in one place, and to occupy one place, and not to be everywhere or in many places at one time.”—P. 95, *as above*.

It has been contended that because the word “corporal” was substituted in 1662 for “real and essential there being,” the declaration has undergone a change of sentiment. It has been said that “corporal” is not equivalent to “real and essential,” “the word corporal being associated with *grosser* and *more carnal* ideas.” We answer:—1. “Real and essential,” as used in 1552 in its connection is *equivalent to corporal*. The declara-

* Hooper’s treatise “De vera Doctrina” has not been translated by the Parker Society. It is very valuable and should be studied in these times, for, like Cranmer’s work, it assails the very positions assumed by the mediævalists. He distinguishes, as Cranmer does, between the presence of the body in the elements, and transubstantiation, directing his arguments mainly against the former.

tion is derived from the Articles of 1552 (XXIX), which has the words "real and bodily," and, in the Latin, "realem et corporalem." Here, then, is the very word as employed by our Reformers, and it is plain that what the 29th Article denied, the declaration, which was *derived from it*, denied.—See p. 134.

Cranmer repeatedly uses the expression "real and corporal presence" as that which he denied.—P. 153, *as before*. See p. 174, *et passim*.

"And, therefore, as in baptism is neither the *real and corporal* presence of Christ's body, *nor* transubstantiation of the water; *no more* is in the Lord's supper either *Christ's flesh and blood really and corporally present*, or the bread and wine transubstantiated." —P. 273, *as before*.

2. The word "corporal," as introduced in 1662, *is the very word used generally by the Reformers*. It is not necessary to give further proof of this.

The reason of the change is obvious. The Reformers were accused of making the sacrament "a bare sign." (See this in the Controversy between Gardiner and Cranmer, "Lord's Supper," p. 144. See also between Harding and Jewel, "Def. of Apol.," p. 540. P.S.) All the opponents of the Reformation urged the objection, *persistently*, that the Reformers denied what was "real and essential." Very properly, therefore, the words "real and essential," which appeared to be ambiguous, were removed, and the word *commonly* used by the Reformers—the word *corporal*—was adopted as the more precise form of expression.*

3. The *reason* for non-adoration is retained from 1552, and consequently the introduction of the word "corporal" does not affect it. *How could the mere rejection of a supposed gross manner of presence of Christ's*

* The Reformers all maintained a true presence in grace. See Ridley, Works, p. 213; Cranmer's "Lord's Supper," Preface and *passim*. Hooper in the same sense says that the body and blood of Christ are "verily and indeed" received by the faithful, "Later Works," p. 49. P.S. The Westminster Confession uses the words "really" and "indeed." The Helvetian Churches employ similar language.

body be a ground for non-adoration of the true glorified body?

4. The declaration rejects "ANY corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood." If the Church hold that there is a supernatural presence of the glorified body, it could not be denied that she holds the presence of the body. But she refuses adoration to

"ANY

corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood."

5. If the Church hold "the objective, actual and real presence" of Christ glorified, a presence "external to the act of the communicant," this careful repudiation of adoration is highly profane, and the Eucharistic service itself is "misconstrued and depraved" by the Church. *Instead of forbidding adoration she ought to enjoin it as a necessary duty.* But it is as plain as possible that our Church, rejecting adoration, rejects the doctrine that would place the real body of Christ, or *Christ himself*, in the elements, on the altar, in the hand of the priest, and in the mouth of the communicant, and not merely a gross *manner* of presence which has not been held *by any public opponent of the Reformers, nor by any Church.*

SECTION III.

THE LORD'S SUPPER; ITS NATURE.

Let us notice the *occasion*, the *circumstances*, the *words of institution* of the Holy Communion, and the *law* regarding *blood*.

The Occasion was the Passover. "Now the first day of the feast of unleavened bread the disciples came to Jesus, saying unto him, Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the *Passover*. . . . Now when the even was come he sat down with the twelve. . . . And as they were eating Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples and said,

Take eat, this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them saying, Drink ye all of it. For this is my blood of the new Testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins."

—Matt. xxvi. 17, 26-28.

The Feast of the Passover was one of *commemoration*. Thus it is written, "I will pass over you. . . . And this day shall be unto you for a *memorial*" (Exodus xii. 13, 14). The Lord Jesus, at the last supper, described the feast as "the Passover," because it was its representation or sign. He said, "With desire I have desired to eat *this* Passover with you before I suffer" (Luke xxii. 15). And so on this occasion, He instituted a feast to commemorate a greater deliverance than that from Egypt, even redemption by His blood. And as Christ described the paschal lamb as "this passover," so He said of the bread and wine respectively, "This is my body which was given for you; this do in *remembrance* of me," and "this cup is the new Testament in my blood which is shed for you" (Luke xxii. 19, 20). The disciples knew that as the lamb was not actually the Passover (the passing over) which took place on the night of deliverance from Egypt, so the bread and wine were not actually the body and blood of Christ.

The circumstances, too, were indicative of the same truth. No unusual ceremonial was observed at the last supper. The feast proceeded as through ages past. There was no altar, no priest, and Jesus instituted the sacrament of His body and blood not after a fast, but during the feast.

The words of institution are plain:—

1. Jesus not only said, "This is my body," "This is my blood," as recorded by St. Matthew, but He added, which is *given* for you," and "which is *shed* for you," according to St. Luke xxii. 20. But His body was not then actually given; His blood was not then shed, and therefore His words could not be understood in a literal and absolute sense. His disciples expressed no astonishment, for His meaning was plain.

2. The Lord Jesus described the Holy Communion as commemorative, saying, "This do *in remembrance* of me."—*Luke* xxii. 19 ; *1 Cor.* xi. 24, 25.

3. The words, "*This cup is* the new Testament in my blood," cannot bear an absolute sense, for the cup was not literally the new Testament. They contain a double figure ; the cup is put for the wine, and the wine is called the new Testament.

4. The law regarding blood is plain and positive.

"But flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat."—*Gen.* ix. 4.

"And whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among you, that eateth any manner of blood ; I will even set my face against that soul that eateth blood, and will cut him off from among his people.

"For the life of flesh is in the blood. . . .

"Therefore I said unto the children of Israel, No soul of you shall eat blood ; neither shall any stranger that sojourneth among you eat blood. . . .

"For it is the life of all flesh ; the blood of it is for the life thereof ; therefore I said unto the children of Israel, Ye shall eat the blood of no manner of flesh : for the life of all flesh is the blood thereof : whosoever eateth it shall be cut off."—*Levit.* xvii. 10, 12-14.

"Ye shall not eat anything with the blood."—*Levit.* xix. 26.

"Only be sure that thou eat not the blood : for the blood is the life ; and thou mayest not eat the life with the flesh."—*Deut.* xii. 23.

"Then they told Saul, saying, Behold the people sin against the Lord in that they eat with the blood. And he said, Ye have transgressed : roll a great stone unto me this day."—*1 Sam.* xiv. 33.

This law regarding blood was *re-asserted* by the Apostles as follows :—

"It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things : 'That ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from

*blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication, from which if ye keep yourselves ye shall do well.'”—*Acts xv. 28, 29.**

5. The doctrine that Christ Himself, the living and glorified Saviour, is under the forms of bread and wine, is thus set forth by the Council of Trent:—

Canon 1. “If any one denieth that in the sacrament of the most Holy Eucharist are contained truly, really, and substantially the body and blood together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently the whole Christ, but saith that He is only therein as in a sign, or figure, or virtue,—let him be anathema.”—*Session xiii.*

Concomitance.—In support of this doctrine that Christ the living Saviour is wholly under the form of the bread, and also wholly under the form of wine, the doctrine of concomitance has been invented, which is that

“The body is under the species of wine, and the blood under the species of bread, and the soul under both by the force of the natural connection and consistency whereby the parts of Christ our Lord, who hath now risen from the dead to die no more, are united together; and the divinity furthermore on account of the admirable hypostatical union thereof with his body and soul.”—*Council of Trent, Session xiii.*

But this doctrine has no foundation whatever in Scripture, and was unknown to the early Church. As Jewel remarks:—

“Now touching this new phantasy of *concomitantia*, after they had once devised a new religion, it was necessary, for aid of the same, to devise also new words. Whereas Christ saith, ‘This is my body,’ they say, ‘This is my body and my blood.’ Where Christ saith, ‘This is my blood,’ they say, ‘This is my blood and my body,’ and in either part they say is whole Christ, God and man. If ye demand how they know it, they say, not by the Word of God, but by the new imagination of *concomitantia*.”—*Controv. with Harding*, p. 534. P.S.

Jesus speaks of His body and blood separately, and in connection with two different elements, bread and wine. The separation points to Him as *dying*, and therefore the Apostle says, “As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye do show the Lord’s

death till he come" (1 Cor. xi. 26). Jesus did not say, under the form of bread, and again under the form of wine, ye shall receive Me living and glorified, but He points to His body as "*given*," and his blood as "*shed*." The Tridentine dogma is therefore irreconcilable with the Holy Communion as administered at the Paschal feast, for it teaches that Christ is received as living and glorified under the above forms, though in point of fact Christ had not yet died, and risen again, and entered upon His glory. For further information on this subject, and the refutation in brief of Romish arguments, see "The Communion and the Mass, a Manual." Shaw, London.

It is also important to remember that the Holy Communion in Apostolic times was administered at a feast called the Agape. Of this we have the clearest evidence in 1 Cor. xi. 23-34. See p. 146.

The Mass. — The Council of Trent teaches that "the same Christ is contained and is bloodlessly immolated" in the Mass, "Who once offered Himself bloodily on the Altar of the Cross," and "therefore that the Sacrifice is truly propitiatory" for both living and dead. —Session 22, c. 2.

This doctrine is repugnant to Scripture, and especially to Heb. ix. 25-28, and Heb. x. 1-18, in which the Apostle teaches (1) that Christ was once offered (ix. 26), as man dies once, so Christ was offered once; (2) that the continuation of Sacrifice proves its inefficacy (Heb. x. 2), but the Mass purports to be a continuance of the sacrifice of Christ; (3) that Christ was offered "once for all" (Heb. x. 10), which implies that the offering is not continued; (4) that Christ has ceased to offer, and therefore is described as having "*sat down*" (Heb. x. 12), in contrast to the Jewish priest, who was "*daily standing*" in offering; (5) and that "**there is NO MORE OFFERING FOR SIN.**" 18.

The Council of Trent decreed that Christ offered Himself in the last supper, but did not venture to add that the offering was propitiatory. Some of the Fathers

of Trent contended that the sacrifice of Christ on that occasion was not propitiatory, as the atoning death had not then taken place. This fact is stated by Canon Waterworth, an eminent Roman Catholic Divine, in his "History of the Council of Trent," published by Dolman, London, 1848.—See p. 17.

The Council of Trent, therefore, while it decreed that the Mass is propitiatory, did not venture to decree that the Holy Communion, which Christ administered the night before His death, was identical with the Mass. But it is plain that the Lord's Supper is the same now as it was when instituted, and therefore not propitiatory.

The Church of England expresses her doctrine in the Thirty-first Article, and in the opening sentences of the Prayer of Consecration, and in other places. The title of the Thirty-first Article is sufficient—"Of the one oblation of Christ finished on the Cross."

SECTION IV.

NON-COMMUNICANT ATTENDANCE,

Or the practice of hearing without receiving, is at variance with the usage of the Church and the service itself. The Prayer Book of 1549 contained the following rubric:—

"Then so many as shall be partakers of the Holy Communion shall tarry still in the quire, or in some convenient place nigh the quire, the men on the one side, and the women on the other side. All other that mind not to receive the Holy Communion shall depart out of the quire, except the ministers and clerks."

But the Reformers made a further and decisive advance in the Prayer Book of 1552. They introduced an exhortation composed by Peter Martyr, to be read "when the curate sees the people negligent to come to the Holy Communion," containing the following passage:—

And whereas ye offend God so sore in refusing this holy

banquet, I admonish, exhort, and beseech you that unto this unkindness ye will not add any more. Which thing ye shall do if ye stand by as *gazers and lookers on* them that do communicate, and be no partakers of the same yourselves. For what thing can this be accounted else than a *further contempt and unkindness unto God*. Truly it is a great unthankfulness to say nay when ye be called; but the fault is much greater when men stand by, and yet will neither eat nor drink this Holy Communion with other. I pray you what can this be else but even to have the mysteries of Christ in *derision*? It is said unto all, Take ye and eat. Take and drink ye all of this. Do this in remembrance of me. With what face, then, or with what countenance, will ye hear these words? What will this be else but a neglecting, a despising, and a mocking of the Testament of Christ? Wherefore, rather than ye should so do, *depart you hence*, and give place to them that be godly disposed."

Dean Goulburn remarks:—"This severe discouragement of non-communicant attendance in the Reformed Church had its effect. The practice of hearing Mass without communicating (as a sort of compensatory act for communicating rarely or never) had its neck broken. In the time of the great revision of 1662 the practice no longer existed; and accordingly, on the assumption doubtless that it would never be revived, the protest against gazing and looking on, having lost its point, was quietly expunged."—*On the Com. Off.*, Appen. No. 3.

The Rev. W. Pope adds that "after the great rebellion men were in no danger of profanely hearing Mass, but in great danger of fancying that the Church sanctioned absence as an alternative which they were free to choose" ("Non-Com. Attend." Lond. 1857). Therefore the passage was removed. Strange that after two hundred years, the practice should be revived!

Non-communicant attendance is at variance with the service, which is framed upon the supposition that all who join in it intend to communicate. Thus the prayer, "We do not presume to come to this thy table trusting in our own righteousness;" the comfortable words, Confession, and Absolution, and the Thanksgiving, have direct, while other parts have indirect reference to communicant.

Dean Goulburn refers to the evil of the practice,

and says:—"The effect must certainly be to diminish the number of *communicants*, even if the number of *attendants* should be increased, and can such an effect be contemplated without dismay?"—*Ibid.*

As to the practice of the Early Church, Maskell remarks:—

"It is so well known that during the first five centuries at least, the universal practice was to allow no one to be present, except communicants, and the last class of penitents, that it would be waste of space and time to repeat authorities which have been cited over and over again."—*Ancient Liturgies*, Pref., lxxix. Lond., 1846.

The class of penitents to whom he alludes were the *consistentes*, who were allowed to witness the Communion, as Dr. Goulburn remarks, as a penance in their own exclusion.

Dr. Goulburn quotes the following passage from Scudamore, an able writer of the Tractarian school, as follows:—"There is an almost universal *consensus* of the better Divines, Ritualists, and Canonists of the Church of Rome, in favour of the historical statement that has been now made, viz., that, with the above named exception of the *consistentes*, no one was permitted to be present at the Sacred Mysteries but those who were able to offer, and to partake of the things offered."—*Ibid.*

The Church of England in her Homily truly says:—"Every one of us must be guests and not gazers. Of necessity we must be ourselves partakers of the table, and not beholders of others."—*The Sacrament*, 1st part.

The Agape.—The Apostle rebukes the Corinthians in more places than one for their divisions. This appears especially in the opening of the epistle (chap. i. 10-13; iii. 3), and again:—"For first of all when you come together in the Church I hear that there be divisions among you, and I partly believe it. For there must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest" (1 Cor. xi. 18). And as an instance of this, he proceeds:—"When ye come

together therefore into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's Supper. For in eating every one taketh before other his own supper; and one is hungry and another is drunken." This was a proof of selfishness and want of Christian union. It appears that this took place on the occasion of sacramental communion, the nature of which the Apostle then proceeds to explain in order to correct their error. He concludes this part of his subject with the exhortation—" Wherefore, my brethren, when ye come together to eat, tarry one for another. And if any man hunger let him eat at home, that ye come not together unto condemnation."

But to what does the Apostle refer when he says—" When ye come together to eat," and when he describes one as being "drunken and another hungry"? He refers to sacramental occasions. The Holy Communion, as administered now by the Christian Church, would not admit of these abuses. It follows, therefore, that our modern Eucharistic customs must differ very much from those which existed in the Corinthian Church. In short, the Communion in Apostolic times was administered at a feast which was called the *Agape*, or feast of love. This is so clear, that it is admitted by theologians, who on other points are diametrically opposed. Thorndike, who was an advanced disciple of the Laudian school, says:—" The Scripture teaches us that the whole Church continued in the Service of God so that, out of the common stock of the Church, common entertainment was provided for the rich and poor, at which entertainment the sacrament of the Eucharist was celebrated as it was instituted by our Lord at His last supper. This is what is called the breaking of bread. Acts ii. 42, xx. 7; and by the Apostle, 1 Cor. xi. 20, 'the supper of the Lord,' not meaning thereby the sacrament, but this common entertainment at which this sacrament was celebrated."—*Works*, p. 540, vol. 1, part 2, *Anglo-Cath. Library*.

As to the expression "the supper of the Lord," see below Olshausen's explanation which is more correct.

Dean Stanley says on *Acts* ii. 42 :—"That it was in some manner either directly connected with or part of a common daily meal."—*On the Corinth.* Lond., 1865.

Olshausen, a German divine, says :—"According to custom among the ancient Christians the celebration of the love feast was regularly connected with that of the Holy Communion, so that the whole ceremony formed a strict commemoration of our Lord's Passover Feast. Together they were received as one operation and called *the Lord's Supper*. All believers, as members of a single God's family, ate and drank together earthly and divine food, in witness of their inward unity for time and eternity."—*Bib. Com. on Corinth.*, p. 180. Edin., 1851.

Neander, the eminent historian, says :—"As to the celebration of the holy supper, it continued to be connected with the common meal in which all, as members of one family, joined as in the primitive Jewish Church, and agreeably to the first institution."—*Hist. of Planting of Christianity*, p. 166. Lond., 1851.

But the most remarkable testimony of all is that of the Douay Bible, which, in its notes on *1 Cor.* xi. 20, says :—"The Lord's Supper.' So the Apostle here calls the charity feasts observed by the primitive Christians, and reprehends the abuses of the Corinthians on these occasions; which were the more criminal because these feasts were accompanied with the celebrating the Eucharistic sacrifice and sacrament."

There is then a *consensus* amongst theologians as to the undoubted fact that the Holy Communion in the primitive Church was accompanied with a meal called the *Agape*. It is not difficult to account for the association. The first communion took place at a meal :—"As they were eating, Jesus took bread and blessed it and brake it, saying, This is my body" (Matt. xxvi. 26). "Likewise also the cup, after supper, saying, this cup is the new Testament in my blood which is shed for you" (Luke xxii. 20). The early Christians,

even in this matter, followed the example of their great Examplar, and partook of the communion at a meal called the Agape. In the first Epistle to the Corinthians, written about twenty-three years after the Ascension and the planting of the Church, we find the Apostle plainly referring to the custom. He does not forbid its continuance, but only reprehends its abuse. By this time, the holy fervour which characterized the disciples who were converted on the day of Pentecost, of whom we read in Acts ii., seems to have grown lukewarm in the Corinthian Church, whose pride and divisions appeared even in the Agape, and the Holy Communion. In the Pentecostal Church, so great was the love existing amongst the brethren that the rich in their liberality sold their possessions, and distributed the proceeds for the benefit of the poorer brethren. But now in the Corinthian Church, the members refused to tarry one for another, and the rich neglecting the poor ; one was drunken, and the other hungry. This painful exhibition might well call forth the beautiful exposition of Agape, or love, given in the 13th chapter, and of which the Corinthians had lost sight in their *Agape*.

Jude also refers to these feasts when he says, "These are spots in your feasts of charity" (*ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις in your agapes*).

We read often of the *Agape* in the early post-apostolic records. Ignatius, in his Epistle to the Smyrneans, says :—"It is not lawful without the Bishop either to baptize or to make an Agape" (*ἀγάπην ποιεῖν*) (chap. viii). Here the Agape is connected with baptism, because the Agape implied the Lord's Supper. Granting that the epistle of Ignatius is not genuine, but the production of the 4th century, its testimony to the Agape is the more remarkable.

Tertullian refers to the Agape at large. Foul calumnies had been heaped upon Christians, especially in reference to the feast. Tertullian, in his *Apology*, rebuts the charge, and writes thus :—" Yet about the modest supper-room of the Christians alone a great ado

is made. Our feast explains itself by its name. The Greeks call it love. . . . As it is an act of religious service, it permits no vileness or immodesty. The participants, before reclining, taste first of prayer to God. As much is eaten as satisfies the cravings of hunger; as much is drunk as befits the chaste. They say it is enough, as those who remember that even during the night they have to worship God; they talk as those who know that the Lord is one of their auditors" (chap. xxxix). Suffice it to say, that the *Agape* lingered in the Church for some hundreds of years after Christ. Owing to various causes, it was gradually disunited from the Sacrament; and at length, when its original design was no longer recognized, it passed into disuse. The Councils of Carthage and Laodicea enacted decrees which were inconsistent with it. The Council of Laodicea, A.D. 372, declared against its celebration in churches, or on the Lord's day. This prohibition is a conclusive testimony to the fact that ere this the *Agape* had been celebrated in church, and on the Lord's day. The Council of Carthage, twenty-two years after, forbade the celebration of the Communion after a meal, except on Maunday Thursday, or the anniversary of its institution. Socrates, the ecclesiastical historian, states that, even at this period, when the *Agape* had fallen into disuse, there were some Catholic Christians who received in the evening, and after a meal. He says:—"The Egyptians in the neighbourhood of Alexandria, and the inhabitants of Thebes . . . do not participate of the mysteries in the manner usual among Christians in general; for after having eaten and satisfied themselves with food of all kinds, in the evening making their oblations, partake of the mysteries" ("Eccles.," lib. v). At this time, the custom, which had been general, became the exception.

These facts throw much light upon the Holy Communion as celebrated in the Apostolic and early Church. They prove that it was observed at, and formed part of

a meal, which shows that it differed *in toto* from the Mass, which is a development of the Middle Ages. Even Roman Catholics themselves have been compelled to acknowledge this. *Leonardo da Vinci*, the eminent artist, who lived before the Reformation, in his famous picture of the Last Supper, represents the Saviour as partaking of a feast with his disciples. Here is no trace of the Mass. The Saviour does not stand with His back to the communicants as He breaks the bread, and distributes the wine, but forms one of their company. He appears in His ordinary attire, and the picture, in all its parts, is in accordance with the facts of the case, and sets forth the first communion as one of the greatest simplicity. The institution of the Holy Communion at a feast, with its subsequent celebration at the *Agape*, is utterly at variance with **fasting** communion which grew up with unscriptural views of the Lord's Supper.

Wine and Water.—Sir Robert Phillimore, Judge of the Court of Arches, ruled that it is lawful to mix water with the wine *before*, but not during service. The judges in the Purchas case ruled that such mixing is unlawful even in the vestry. They reason as follows:—“The addition of water is prescribed in the Prayer Book of 1549; it has disappeared from the later books, and that omission must have been designed. The rubric of 1662, following that of 1604, says, ‘the bread and wine for the Communion shall be provided by the curate and churchwardens at the charges of the parish.’ So far wine not mixed with water must be intended. The priest is directed in the rubric before the prayer for the Church Militant to place on the table so much bread and wine as he shall think sufficient. Of so much of this wine as may remain unconsecrated, it is said that ‘the curate shall have it to his own use.’ These directions make it appear that the wine has not been mingled with water but remains the same throughout. If the wine had been mingled with water, before being placed on the

table, then the portion of it that might revert to the curate would have undergone the symbolical mixing, which cannot surely have been intended." This reasoning is so forcible as to the rubrics that the question needs no further discussion.

SUPPLEMENT.

The Ancient Liturgies.—Certain liturgies have been attributed to St. Peter, St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. James; but, as Dupin remarks, they "are not theirs in reality." Dupin was an eminent Doctor of the Sorbonne, well-known as a learned writer; he lived and died in the Communion of the Church of Rome. He states that Liturgiologists agree in admitting that the Holy Communion was celebrated by "the Apostles and those who succeeded them" with "*great simplicity*." He says that "little by little" prayers and ceremonies were added to make the Sacrament appear "more sacred in the eyes of the people." Dupin shows in detail that the liturgies attributed to Apostles are spurious.

Liturgy of St. Peter.—He says, it cannot be the liturgy of St. Peter for the following reason:—

"In it, there is mention made of St. Sixtus, of Corneille, and of Cyprian. In it, the Virgin is called the Mother of God, an expression which was not common before the error of Nestorius had been condemned. The Canon of the Latin Mass, which St. Gregory said had been composed by a scholastic, that is to say, by a learned man of the 5th century, is inserted the *whole* (*tout entier*); it contains collects (prayers) drawn (borrowed) from the Sacramentary of St. Gregory, and from the liturgies of St. Basil, and St. Chrysostom. In it, they pray for the *Patriarchs*, an expression *unknown* before the end of the 4th century of the Church, and also for the *very religious Emperors*. In fine, if this liturgy had been by St. Peter, the Romish Church would have used it, and it would not have been unknown during

so many centuries. These reasons made the learned Cardinal Bona say, that this liturgy was *supposed* or *putative*; and that it had been composed apparently by some Greek versed in the Latin tongue (latinisè), because it is taken in part from the liturgy of the Greeks, and in part from that of the Latins, and that they gave it the name of the liturgy of St. Peter, in order either that it might have more authority, or because it contained a great portion of the liturgy of the Romish Church."

Liturgy of St. Matthew.—He says that—

"The Mass of the Ethiopians, which bears the name of St. Matthew, is manifestly supposititious. In it, they pray for the Popes, the Kings, the Patriarchs, and the Archbishops. In it, the twelve Apostles are invoked. In it, they commemorate the four Evangelists, and speak of the Synods of Nice, of Constantinople, and of Ephesus. In it, they sing the Symbol of Nice, with the particle (Filioque). In it they make mention of St. Athanasius, of St. Gregory, and of St. Basil of Epretus, of the golden number, and of Trisagion. This shows that this liturgy is very new."

Liturgy of St. Mark.—Dupin says:—

"We must pass the same judgment on the liturgy of St. Mark given by Cardinal Sirlet, and published in Paris by Morel; in it is to be found the word Consubstantial and the Trisagion; in it they pray for the King, and St. Mark even; they also make mention of chalices, deacons, sub-deacons, choristers, monks, nuns, &c.—things which stamp it with novelty."

Liturgy of St. James.—Dupin says:—

"There remains now only the liturgy attributed to St. James, which some ingenious people took the trouble of defending, but to no purpose; for though it be more ancient than that we have just examined, since it was quoted in the Council which was held in the palace of the Emperor, after the fifth General Council; it cannot be said, nevertheless, that St. James was the author (of it), or that it had been composed in

his time. For, 1st, in this liturgy the Virgin is called the Mother of God ; the Son and the Holy Ghost are said (in it) to be consubstantial with the Father, terms which were not in use in St. James's times. But granting that they had, is it credible that they would not have adduced that authority (argument) in the Councils of Nice, of Ephesus, and of Constantinople ? 2nd. The terms—Trisagion and Doxology—are found in it, that is to say, the Sanctus and the Gloria Patri, which were not in common use in the Church before the 5th century. . . . 3rd. They pray for those who are cloistered in monasteries ; *but who can say that they existed in St. James's time?* 4th. Mention is made of Confessors, a term which was only used in the Divine office a long time after St. James, according to Bellarmine himself. 5th. This liturgy speaks of temples, the incensing of altars, but *who will believe that these things were in use in St. James's times ?*—*New Library of Eccles. Authors.* Utrecht, 1831.

There were many other liturgies.

The liturgy in the “Apostolic Constitutions,” so-called, bears the name of Clement, but is not his. The “Apostolic Constitutions” are the product probably of the 4th century. There is reason to believe that this is the most ancient liturgy.

The liturgy of Basil, Bishop of Cæsarea, A.D. 370, used in the patriarchate of Constantinople, has suffered by interpolation.

The liturgy ascribed to Chrysostom, Bishop of Constantinople, A.D. 397, is very similar to that of Basil.

The liturgy ascribed to Cyril, A.D. 444, was used in the Egyptian Church.

The African liturgy is not now extant. Augustine and others allude to it.

The Gallican liturgy is ascribed to Hilary of Poictiers, A.D. 350, and others. It differed in many respects from the Roman.

The Mosarabic, or Spanish liturgy, was set aside by the influence of the Pope in favour of the Roman.

The Roman liturgy was the work of several hands. Leo, A.D. 451, Gelasius, A.D. 494, and Gregory, A.D. 594, contributed to it. Gregory states that in its original form it was composed by *Scholasticus*, and adds that the Apostles consecrated with the Lord's Prayer.—See p. 156.

Bingham, in reference to the variety of liturgies, and the changes which were made in them from time to time, remarks that “the very liberty which every bishop had to frame the liturgy of his own Church, was one reason why none of these are now remaining perfect and entire as they were at first composed for the use of such a particular Church” (“Antiq.,” p. 588, vol. ii.). It appears that bishops altered them according to their own pleasure.

These liturgies, though containing much that is unscriptural and superstitious, bear witness to the fact that the Tridentine doctrine of the Mass had not been developed at the time of their composition. They speak of an oblation and sacrifice, but the expressions which they use are inconsistent with the notion that the sacrifice consisted in the offering up of Christ, the Lord, Himself. We cite, as an example, the following words from the Clementine Liturgy:—“Let us beseech God, through His Christ, in behalf of the gift that has been brought to the Lord God; that the good God will receive it through the mediation of His Christ, at his heavenly altar, for the savour of a sweet smell.” This prayer is offered up after the consecration of the elements. If the gift were supposed to be literally Christ Himself, this would have been a prayer that God would accept Christ Himself through the mediation of Christ! Dean Good truly remarks, “the presumption of man praying that God would accept Christ's offering is what I believe no priesthood has as yet professedly reached.”—*On the Eucharist*, p. 457, vol. i. Lond., 1856.

So also the priest prays in the liturgy of Basil that God “will not on account of his sins prevent the grace of His Holy Spirit from resting on the gifts lying before

him." This prayer cannot be reconciled with the notion that the gifts are Christ Himself.

Even the Roman Canon of the Mass, though thoroughly unscriptural, does not come up to the Tridentine doctrine of the Mass. The Canon was composed before that doctrine was developed.

The following remarks by Bishop Patrick are important as showing that the *Canon* of the Mass is inconsistent with transubstantiation:—"But it is impossible to reconcile this to those foregoing prayers. For at the beginning of the canon, they pray that 'God would accept and bless these donations and gifts, these holy undefiled sacrifices'—that is, the oblations of bread and wine, which are no more than so, till the words of consecration.

"After this (as you heard) they pray that 'this oblation may be made to us, the body and blood of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ.' Which do not imply a change of substances; for those words (*fiat nobis*) 'be made to us,' may very well consist with the oblations remaining in substance what they were before, only begging the communication of the virtue and efficacy of Christ's passion to themselves.

"And that this is the sense of the canon appears by those words after consecration, when they say, 'We offer to Thy Majesty a pure sacrifice of Thy donations and gifts.' Which words plainly suppose that they are in nature what they were, God's creatures still, not the appearance and shadow of them only. But they call them now 'the bread of eternal life, and the cup of salvation;' because after they are blessed and made sacraments, they are not now to be looked upon as bodily food, but as the food of our souls, as representing that body of Christ, and His passion, which is the bread of eternal life.

"If they had understood nothing to remain now after consecration but Christ's natural body, they would not have called this Thy *gifts*, in the plural number, but expressed it in the singular, Thy *gift*.

Neither can they refer to the remaining accidents, because they are no real things, and rather tell us what God has taken away (the whole substance of them), than what he has given.

“But then, what follows puts it out of all doubt: ‘upon which (still in the plural) look propitiously.’ If it had been, ‘look upon us propitiously for the sake of Christ,’ it had been well enough. Or, to desire of God to look ‘upon these things, propitiously which they offer;’ if they mean (as he that made the prayer did), that God would accept this oblation of bread and wine, as He did of Abel and Melchizedek (which latter was indeed bread and wine), this had been very proper. But to make that which we offer to be Christ Himself (as they that believe transubstantiation must expound it), and to desire God to look propitiously and benignly upon Him, when there can be no fear that He should ever be unacceptable to His Father, and none can be so foolish as to think that Christ stands in need of our recommendation to God for acceptance, this sense can never be agreeable to the prayer. Therefore the most ancient of all the spurious liturgies, I mean that attributed to Clement in his ‘Constitutions,’* has given us the true sense of it: ‘We offer to Thee this bread and this cup, and we beseech Thee to look favourably upon these gifts set before Thee, O God, who standest in need of nothing, and be well pleased with them for the honour of Thy Christ,’ &c.

“Would it not run finely, to pray that God would be well pleased with Christ, for the honour of His Christ?

“But besides the petition, that God would look propitiously upon them, it follows in the canon, ‘that God would accept them, as He did the gifts of Abel, and Abraham, and Melchizedek.’ How unagreeable is this (if Christ himself be understood here), to make the comparison for acceptance betwixt a lamb and a

* Lib. viii, c. 12.

calf, or bread and wine, and Christ the Son of God, with Whom He was always highly pleased !

“ But then what follows still entangles matters more in the Church of Rome’s sense ; the prayer, that God ‘ would command these things to be carried by the hands of His holy angels to the high altar above.’ For how can the body of Christ be carried by angels to heaven, which never left it since His ascension, but is always there ? Besides the high altar above, in the sense of the ancients is Christ Himself. And Remigius of Auxerre tells us,* that St. Gregory’s opinion of the sacrament was, that ‘ it was snatched into heaven by angels, to be joined to the body of Christ there.’ But then in the sense of transubstantiation, what absurd stuff is here to pray, that Christ’s body may be joined to His own body.”—*Transubstantiation*, p. 269, vol. ix, *Gibson’s Preservative*. Lond., 1848.

CHAPTER XVI.

SECTION I.

THE BAPTISMAL SERVICES.

Sources.—Our Reformers had before them a book of Services prepared by Bucer and Melancthon, at the request of Hermann, Prince Archbishop of Cologne, who sought to promote the Reformation in his diocese. The Baptismal Service of the same was specially assigned to Bucer. The book of services was entitled (translation), “A simple and religious Consultation of us Hermann, by the grace of God Archbishop of Cologne, and Prince Elector,” &c. The English Reformers took many hints from this book, and engrafted several portions into the English Reformed Prayer Book. Our Services bear deeply the impress of the Reformation.

* “ *De Celebrat. Missæ in Bibl. Pat.*,” 2nd edit. p. 1164, tom. vi.

The book of 1549 retained the following superstitions:—

The Exorcism:—

“Then let the priest, looking upon the children, say,—

“I command thee, unclean spirit, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, that thou come out, and depart from these infants whom our Lord Jesus Christ hath vouchsafed to call to his holy baptism, to be made members of his body, and of his holy congregation. Therefore, thou cursed spirit, remember thy sentence, remember thy judgment, remember the day to be at hand wherein thou shalt burn in fire everlasting, prepared for thee and thy angels, and presume not hereafter to exercise any tyranny towards these infants, whom Christ hath bought with his precious blood, and by this his holy baptism calleth to be of his flock.”

The Clothing of the Child in a Chrisom and the Anointing:—

“Then the godfathers and godmothers shall take and lay their hands upon the child, and the minister shall put upon him his white vesture, commonly called the chrisom; and say:—

“Take this white vesture for a token of the innocency, which by God’s grace in this holy sacrament of baptism is given unto thee; and for a sign whereby thou art admonished, so long as thou livest, to give thyself to innocency of living, that after this transitory life, thou mayest be partaker of the life everlasting. Amen.

“Then the priest shall anoint the infant upon the head, saying,

“Almighty God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath regenerate thee by water and the Holy Ghost, and hath given unto thee remission of all thy sins; he vouchsafe to anoint thee with the unction of his Holy Spirit, and bring thee to the inheritance of everlasting life. Amen.”

The Special Benediction of the Water with Crossing in the following prayer:—

O most merciful God our Saviour Jesu Christ, who hast ordained the element of water for the regeneration of thy faithful people, upon whom, being baptized in the river of Jordan, the Holy Ghost came down in likeness of a dove: Send down, we beseech thee, the same thy Holy Spirit to assist us, and to be present at this our invocation of thy holy name: Sanctify + this fountain of baptism, thou that art the sanctifier of all things, that by the power of thy word all those that shall be baptized therein may be spiritually regenerated, and made the children of everlasting adoption. Amen.

These, with other points, were omitted in 1552. Peter Martyr therefore says:—“All things have been removed from it (the Prayer Book) which could nourish superstition.”—*Letter to Bullinger*, as before.

The first rubric in the book of 1549 opened as follows:—

“ It appeareth by ancient writers, that the Sacrament of Baptism in the old time was not commonly ministered, but at two times in the year: at Easter and Whitsuntide, at which times it was openly ministered, in the presence of all the congregation. Which custom (now being grown out of use) although it cannot for many considerations be well restored again, yet it is thought good to follow the same as near as conveniently may be.”

This was omitted in 1661, and the rubric proceeds as before with the substitution, at the close, of the words, “ Children may be baptized upon any other day” for “ ought at all times to be baptized either at the church or at home.”

The second rubric was inserted in 1661.

The third rubric, composed in 1549, directed the parties to “ be ready at the church door.” In 1552 the words “at the font” were substituted for “at the church door.” The former practice was a remnant of the order of admitting Catechumens at the door, which, in course of time, came to be accompanied with the blessing of salt, with exorcisms, crossings, and unction. The direction was inserted in 1661 to fill the font with water at each baptism.

The question at the opening of the service implies that baptism is not to be repeated. It existed in the older offices.

The address “ Dearly beloved ” was composed in 1549, and, in some points, is similar to that in Hermann’s service.

The first prayer was composed in 1549, and is similar to a form, attributed to Luther, occurring in Hermann’s service.

The second prayer is from the Sarum Manual. This was followed in the book of 1549 by the exorcism, already quoted, omitted in 1552.

The Gospel is taken from Hermann’s service.

The Exhortation, with the succeeding prayer of Thansksgiving, was composed in 1549, and was suggested by a similar form in Hermann’s service.

The Address to the Sponsors, "Dearly Beloved," was composed in 1549, and is similar to that in Hermann's service.

The Demands, which are of immemorial use, are like those in Hermann's service, addressed to the Sponsors:—The words, "In the name of this child," were added in 1661.

The Creed follows. Philip said to the Eunuch, who desired to be baptized, "If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest." And he answered and said, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God" (Acts viii, 37). A profession of faith necessarily precedes baptism. The creed itself took its rise from the nature of the case. For the creed, *see* p. 91.

The Sarum Office contained the question and answer, "Wilt thou be baptized. Answer: I will." Our office is as follows:—"Wilt thou be baptized in this faith? Answer: That is my desire."

The question and answer as to obedience, "Wilt thou then obediently," &c., were added in 1661.

The four prayers following "O Merciful God," were modified from several prayers recomposed in 1549.

The prayer which immediately precedes baptism, "Almighty everliving God," is a modified form, prepared in 1549, of the prayer in the Sarum office.

The words, "Sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sin," were added in 1661. There is a similar prayer in the Presbyterian service provided in "*the Collections and Observations methodized concerning the worship, discipline, and government of the Church of Scotland, in four books,*" published in Edinburgh in 1709. The second book of this Presbyterian work treats "of the worship of God and sacred things." Here directions are given for the administration of baptism. After an exhortation to the parent or sponsor, this directory proceeds:—"This being done, prayer is also to be joined with the word of institution for *sanctifying the water to this spiritual use.*" "The prayer is to this or the like effect." The minister is to

pray that God "would join the inward baptism of His Spirit with the outward baptism of water." This is what is meant by the sanctifying of the elements. Surely, it is hypercritical to object to this.

It is written that "Jesus took the loaves and blessed them and brake?" (*εὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς καὶ κατέκλασε*).* Do we not bless our food? What do we mean? That God would accompany the food with His blessing. "Sanctify this water to the mystical (*i.e.*, the symbolical) washing away of sin." What do we mean? That God "would join the inward baptism of His Spirit with the outward baptism of water."

The naming of the child is inherited from the Jewish Church. Thus John was named at the Circumcision.—*Luke i. 59, 60.*

Baptism by immersion is the rule according to the rubric, "if they shall certify him that the child may well endure it, he shall dip it in the water discreetly and warily;" but the exception has practically become the rule from the nature of our climate.

The rubric of 1549 required the child to be dipped three times, "first dipping the right side, second the left side, the third time dipping the face toward the font," but trine immersion was abolished in the revision of 1552.

The words of reception—"We receive"—were introduced in 1552.

The address—"Seeing now"—was composed for the book of 1552.

The prayer of thanksgiving—"We yield thee"—was composed for the book of 1552.

The exhortation to the Godfathers and Godmothers—"Forasmuch as this child"—was inserted in its present form in 1661. It is derived from the following rubric in the book of 1552:—

"The minister shall command that the children be brought to the bishop to be confirmed of him, so soon as they can say, in their vulgar tongue, the Articles of the

* Luke ix. 16.

faith, the Lord's Prayer, and the ten Commandments, and be further instructed in the Catechism set forth for that purpose, accordingly as it is there expressed."

The reference to the Chrisom, or white garment, in the book of 1549 was omitted in 1552.

The statement regarding the salvation of infants—"it is certain by God's Word that children which are baptized dying before they commit actual sin are undoubtedly saved"—formed part of the Preface to the Confirmation Service till 1661, when it was transferred to its present position. The words, "before they commit actual sin," were inserted in 1661.

The Articles of 1536 contained the following statement as to baptism:—

"Insomuch as infants and children dying in their infancy shall undoubtedly be saved thereby, *and else not.*"

The words "*else not*" do not occur in our rubric.

Dr. Mozley remarks that this rubric "may be accepted and subscribed with perfect honesty by one who thinks it certain by God's Word that all infants, even those who are unbaptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are saved. . . . There is nothing in the terms of this statement as they lie before us to prevent the person just mentioned from subscribing to it. . . . It may be accepted and subscribed to again with perfect honesty by predestinarians who regard the early death of Christian infants, and their removal from the evil to come as a sign of their election."—*Review of Bap. Con.*, p. 23-6, as before.

SECTION II.

THE MINISTRATION OF PRIVATE BAPTISM OF CHILDREN IN HOUSES.

The opening rubrics were as follows in the books of 1549, 1552 and 1559:—

"The pastor and curates shall oft admonish the people, that they defer not the baptism of infants any longer than the Sunday."

or other holy day next after the child be born, unless upon a great and reasonable cause declared to the curate, and by him approved.

“And also they shall warn them, that without great cause and necessity they baptize not children at home in their houses. And when great need shall compel them so to do, that then they minister it on this fashion.

“First, *let them that be present* call upon God for his grace, and say the Lord’s Prayer, if the time will suffer. And then one of *them* shall name the child, and dip him in the water, or pour water upon him, saying these words.”

The rubric was altered in 1604 as follows:—

“First, let the *lawful minister*, and them that be present, call upon God for his grace, and say the Lord’s Prayer, if time will suffer. And then the child being named by some one that is present, the said minister shall dip it in the water, or pour water upon it, saying these words.”

The alteration was effected in compliance with the views of the puritans, expressed in the Hampton Court Conference—views which accorded with those of the King.

In 1661, for “*lawful minister*,” the words were substituted, “*the minister of the parish, or, in his absence, any other lawful minister*.”

The prayer beginning—“We yield thee hearty thanks”—was added in 1661.

SECTION III.

BAPTISM OF SUCH AS ARE OF RIPER YEARS.

This service was prepared in 1661, and authorized in 1662. It is noticed in the following terms in the Preface to the Prayer Book:—“Which” (the service) “although not so necessary when the former book was compiled, yet by the growth of Anabaptism, through the licentiousness of the late times crept in among us, is now become necessary, and may be always useful for the baptizing of natives in our plantations, and others converted to the faith.” It is simply a second edition of the service for the public baptism of infants adapted to the case of adults. The addresses are not given to the sponsors, as in the former service, but to the candidates. St. John iii. 1-8, as the Gospel, supplies

the place of Mark x. 13-16. The godfathers and godmothers are witnesses not sponsors.

SECTION IV.

THE CATECHISM.

The Catechism was first published in the book of 1549, and was connected with the Confirmation Service under the following title :—“Confirmation wherein is contained a Catechism for children.”

The word Catechism derived from *κατηχησις* (katechesis) denotes oral instruction.

The Puritans in the Hampton Court Conference, A.D. 1604, complained that “this public short Catechism was defective on the point of the Sacraments, whereupon it was ordered that the Bishops should make an addition.”—*Notes attributed to Bishop Cosin. See Nicholl's additional notes.*

The want was supplied by the addition to the Catechism in 1604 of the questions and answers on the two Sacraments.

The former part of the Catechism was composed in 1549.

The latter part relating to the Sacraments was abridged from Nowell's Catechism of 1561. This latter work had been constructed upon the lines of Ponet's Catechism of 1553, to which Cranmer and Ridley contributed.

The authorship of the Sacramental part of the Catechism has been attributed to Bishop Overall, but without authority. The learned Bishop of Chester (Dr. Jacobson), who has published Nowell's Catechism, truly remarks in his Preface :—“The first part of this smaller Catechism (Nowell's) agrees exactly with that given in the two liturgies of King Edward VI, and the additions made by Bishop Overall, after the Hampton Court Conference, were evidently abridged from it.”

Certain notes, attributed to Bishop Cosin, state that Overall “penned” this part of the Catechism, but this implies not that he composed, but abridged it. The abridgment was submitted to the bishops, among whom was Archbishop Whitgift whose decidedly Protestant views are unquestioned. The Catechism was separated from the Confirmation Service in 1661.

The words “wherein I was made a member of Christ, the child of God and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven,” are well explained in Mayer’s Catechism, “published,” as Dr. Mozley remarks, “under Laud’s Primacy, and a book of some authority.” He says:—“In our baptism we are *sacramentally* and *instrumentally* made the children of God, and really and truly when we are baptized with the Holy Ghost.”—*Quoted by Mozley*, p. 172, as before.

But on this subject *see p. 176.*

Some have contended that “generally” in the answer, “two only as generally necessary to salvation,” means *universally*. We turn to Ogilvie’s Dictionary, and find the following exposition of the word “generally”:—“In general; extensively, though not universally.” The compilers of this portion of the Catechism did not write, which are necessary to salvation, but “generally necessary.” Archbishop Secker, referring to the two sacraments, says:—“But even these two, our Church very charitably teaches us not to look upon as indispensably, but as *generally* necessary. Out of which general necessity we are to except those particular cases where believers in Christ either have not the means of performing their duty in respect to the Sacraments, or are ignorantly innocent of it, or even excusably mistaken about it.”—*Lectures on the Catechism.*

On this subject see Marshall’s able and valuable work on Durel’s “Latin Prayer Book.” Oxford, 1882.

The words “the body and blood of Christ which are verily and indeed taken and received by *the faithful* in the Lord’s Supper” are inconsistent with transubstantiation, and corporal presence in the elements, for they

confine the blessing to the *faithful*, according to the last clause in the 28th Article which states that "the *mean* whereby we feed on the body of Christ is *faith*," but faith not being a body does not feed actually on the body of Christ. "Feed on him in thy *heart* by *faith* with *thanksgiving*" (*Address in Communion*). In the revised Catechism of the Church of Ireland the above clause of the 28th Article is added to this answer.

SECTION V.

CONFIRMATION.

According to the mediæval custom, the baptism of infants was immediately followed by confirmation; but this practice was rejected by our Reformers, who required that children should be instructed before confirmation, as it appears from the following titles of confirmation and the catechism in the book of 1549 and 1552:—"Confirmation wherein is contained a Catechism for children." "A Catechism, That is to say, An Instruction to be learned of every child before he be brought to be confirmed of the Bishop." These titles were recast in 1604 and 1662 as follows:—

The book of 1604.

"The order of Confirmation, or Laying on of hands upon children baptized, and able to render an account of their faith according to the Catechism following."

"A Catechism, That is to say, An instruction to be learned of every child, before he is brought to be confirmed by the Bishop."

"Confirmation, or, laying on of hands."

The book of 1662.

"A Catechism, that is to say, An Instruction to be learned of every person, before he be brought to be confirmed by the Bishop."

"The order of Confirmation, or laying on of hands upon those that are baptized and come to years of *discretion*."

The substitution of “every person” for “every child,” and “those that are baptized and come to years of discretion” for “able to render an account of their faith,” indicates still further the departure from the mediæval custom.

The address—“To the end that confirmation”—is derived from the explanatory rubries which preceded the Catechism until 1662, and which were composed by the Reformers. It retains the principles set forth therein, with the substitution in 1552 of “ratify and confirm” for “ratify and confess,” as used in the book of 1549.

The question—“Do ye here, in the presence of God,” with its answer, “I do”—was inserted in 1661. Until then, the service opened with the versicles, “Our help,” &c., gathered from Scripture.

The prayer—“Almighty and everlasting God”—is a recomposed form of a prayer used from the earliest times.

In reference to the forgiveness of sins spoken of therein, Archbishop Secker’s remark is worthy of attention:—

“And therefore let no one misunderstand this expression in the office” (“and hast given unto them forgiveness of all their sins”) “which hath parallel ones in the New Testament, Ephes. i. 7, Col. i. 14; so as either to censure it, or to delude himself with a fatal imagination that anything said once to him can possibly convey to him a pardon of sins for which he is not *truly penitent*. We only acknowledge, with due thankfulness, that God hath done his part; but which of the congregation have done theirs, their own conscience must tell them.”—Quoted by Dr. Stephens in *Book of Com. Prayer, with Notes, in loco.*

The prayer—“Defend,” accompanied with laying on of hands—was composed in 1552. This manual act was not practised in the mediæval Church.

The collect—“Almighty and everlasting God”—was composed in 1549.

The collect—“O Almighty Lord”—was inserted in 1661. Palmer remarks that it cannot be traced “to the primitive formularies of the English Church or of any other.”

SECTION VI.

BAPTISM AND ITS EFFECTS.

Regeneration.—The word *παλιγγενεσία* (pallingenesia), which means regeneration, occurs twice in the New Testament, Matt. xix. 28 and Titus iii. 5. Dr. Vaughan truly remarks that it denotes “any change from evil and towards good, any change by which a living being is transferred from a condition of disadvantage and suffering into one of benefit and happiness” (“The Revision of the Liturgy,” p. 24). He adds, that the great Roman orator describes his restoration from exile by the word regeneration, “his *παλιγγενεσία*.”—*Ibid.*

There are, however, other equivalent expressions which bear the same meaning—such as “born again” (*γεννηθῆ ἄνωθεν*), John iii. 3; “born of God,” 1 John v. 1. We cannot, therefore, limit the doctrine of regeneration to Matt. xix. 28 and Titus iii. 5. These expressions denote (1) a change of state, and (2) moral renovation.

Change of State.—Christ speaks of “the *children* of the kingdom” who shall be cast “into outer darkness” (Matt. viii. 12). This implies the figure of *birth* by which the Jews became children.

But it sometimes denotes also moral renovation. “Every one that loveth is born of God and knoweth God” (1 John iv. 7). Dr. Mozley holds that this is the true meaning, and no doubt it is, as denoting regeneration in its full sense—namely, a new state of privilege and a change of heart. The following fact, however, admitted by Dr. Mozley, is of great importance:—“It is well known that this term” (regeneration) “was in Jewish use before it was adopted by the new dispensation, and that as a Jewish term it contracted a technical meaning and stood for the admission of a proselyte, which took place by baptism. ‘The common phrase,’ says Wall, *was to call the baptism of the proselyte his regeneration or new birth.*’ It contracted the same conventional sense in the Christian Church, which ‘appropriated,’ as Wall

says, ‘the word regeneration as much to signify baptism, as we do the word christening’—i.e., as a convertible for it.”—*Review of the Baptismal Controv.*, p. 162. Lond., 1883.

The External and Internal.—The distinction between a condition of *external* privilege and *internal* renovation appears both from the Old and New Testament in many texts from which we quote a few.—Moses says to the Jews: “Ye are the children of the Lord your God” (Deut. xiv). “For thou art an *holy* people unto the Lord thy God. The Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself above all people that are upon the face of the earth” (Deut. vii. 6). Further, he says:—“Yet they are *thy people* and thine inheritance” (Deut. ix. 29). Yet, he had said to the Jews in v. 24:—“Ye have been rebellious against the Lord from the day that I knew you.”

The Jews were admitted into covenant relation to God by circumcision. The Lord said to Abraham:—“This is my covenant, which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee: every man child among you shall be circumcised” (Gen. xvii. 10). But Scripture refers also to the circumcision of *the heart*. “Circumcise therefore the foreskin of *your heart*, and be no more stiffnecked” (Deut. x. 16). “And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine *heart*” (Deut. xxx. 6). “Circumcise yourselves to the Lord, and take away the foreskins of *your heart*” (Jer. iv. 4). Therefore the Apostle says:—“For he is not a Jew which is one *outwardly*; neither is that circumcision which is *outward in the flesh*. But he is a Jew which is one *inwardly*, and circumcision is that of the *heart*, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men but of God.”—*Rom.* i. 28, 29.

The same distinction applies to the Christian Church. St. Paul writes to the various churches as sanctified. He writes to “all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints” (Rom. i. 7). He writes “to the Church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are

sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints" (1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1; Ephes. i. 1; Coloss. i. 1). Further, the children of a Christian parent are described as "holy:" "else were your children unclean, but now are they holy."—1 Cor. vii. 14.

The word *ἄγιος* (Hagios) signifies devoted to sacred purposes, from *ἄγισθω*, "to hallow, to make sacred, to dedicate, Lat. *dedicare*" (see Lexicon, Liddell and Scott), or as Bagster expresses it, "separate from common condition and use." But this does not necessarily imply moral renovation for the word, and its cognates are often applied to *insensible* objects. Thus we read of "holy ground" (Exod. iii. 5), "sanctify his field" (Leviticus xxvii. 18); "hallowed" censers (Numbers xvi. 37); "the sanctuary," or "holy" as in the margin; "the holiest of all," beyond the vail, "the holy places" (Heb. ix. 2, 3, 24). Numerous other instances might be given. But to sanctify, or hallow, or make holy is the act "by which" a thing or person is dedicated to God.

Here it is well to notice an objection as it regards the application of the term "children" to the Israelites; and saints, or holy, to the members of Christian Churches. Holding that the expressions "children of God," "born of God," and "saints," always denote "actual goodness," or moral renovation, some have contended that the Israelites "having received an actual religious mould from the fashioning hand of God," and being described in their unity as "the righteous nation," the term "children," even in their case, implies "actual goodness." This far-fetched interpretation will not bear the test. Is it possible that the word "children," as descriptive of the Israelites *as a whole*, can indicate more than dedication and covenant privilege, when we remember how they provoked the Most High time after time, and at length "killed the Prince of Life?" In their dispersion, they are still the people of God, for "God hath not cast away his people" (Rom. xi. 1); but surely this does not imply that they are His in the sense of

“actual goodness” or moral renovation! It has been said that “we have to do not with the Old Testament but with the New Testament use of the word.” But the New Testament affords the clearest proof that the words, sanctify and holy, which are admitted to be synonymous with the above expressions, are sometimes so applied that they can only mean dedication and external privilege. The text, 1 Cor. vii. 14, is conclusive. The unbelieving husband is *sanctified* by the believing wife, and *vice versâ*. And their children are *holy*. Here the term can only denote privilege and dedication. The husband *though unbelieving is sanctified*. The children though incapable of belief are *holy*. This is so clear that it is unnecessary to proceed further in the argument.

Our Reformers recognize the distinction between external privilege and internal renovation.

Cranmer says that—

“Those that come feignedly and those that come unfeignedly both be washed with the sacramental water, but both be not washed with the Holy Ghost and clothed with Christ.”—*The Lord's Supper*, p. 221. P.S.

Latimer says :—

“He must have a regeneration: and what is this regeneration? *It is not to be christened in water*, as these firebrands expound it, and nothing else. How is it to be expounded then? St. Peter sheweth that one place of Scripture declareth another. It is the circumstance and collation of places that makes Scripture plain. *Regeneramur autem*, saith St. Peter. ‘And we be born again:’ how? *Non ex semine mortali, sed immortali*, ‘Not by a mortal seed, but by an immortal.’ What is this immortal seed? *Per sermonem Dei viventis*: ‘*By the word of the living God*;’ by the word of God *preached and opened*. Thus cometh in our new birth.”—*Sermon*, p. 202. P.S.

We adopt the words of Mr. Scott :—

“In this *lower, external, and ecclesiastical* sense, therefore, we may affirm *unconditionally* the regeneration of all to whom baptism is rightly administered.

“But in the *higher and spiritual* sense of the term, we can predicate regeneration of baptized persons only *hypothetically*: namely, upon the supposition, in the case of adults, of their sincerity; and in the case of infants, of their possessing that disposition which shall lead them, when they become capable of, to keep their baptismal vows.”—*Inquiry into the Effects of Baptism*, p. 163.

Richard Baxter, who was leader of the Puritans at the Savoy Conference, recognizes the same distinction when he says:—

“All that the minister warrantably baptizeth are SACRAMENTALLY REGENERATE, and are *in foro ECCLESIAE*, members of Christ, children of God, and heirs of heaven; but it is only those that are *sincerely delivered up in covenant to God in Christ*, that are SPIRITUALLY and REALLY REGENERATE, and are such as shall be owned for members of Christ and children of God *in foro CÆLI*;—therefore, it is not unfit that the minister call the baptized REGENERATE and PARDONED members of Christ, and children of God and heirs of heaven—supposing that, *in foro Ecclesiæ*, they were the due subjects of baptism; but if the persons be such as ought not to be baptized, the sin then is, not in calling baptized persons REGENERATE, but in baptizing those who ought not to have been baptized, and to whom the seal of the covenant was not due.”—*Works*, p. 45, vol. v. Lond., 1830.

Many are incorporated into the Church, and thus united to its great Head by external bonds, who do not possess a renewed heart. This appears forcibly in the figure of the vine and its branches:—“I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman. Every branch in me that beareth not fruit *he taketh away.*”—*John xv. 1, 2.*

Many are endowed with gifts who are as “nothing.”

The Apostle enumerates gifts:—

The Holy Spirit and his gifts and privileges.—“For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; to another faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit.” He adds “miracles,” “prophecy,” “discerning of spirits,” “tongues,” and “the interpretation of tongues” (1 Cor. xii. 8-10). He mentions baptism in connection with gifts:—“For by one spirit we are all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have all been made to drink

into one Spirit" (v. 13). But these gifts of the Holy Spirit were in some instances possessed without renovation of heart, for the Apostle says, in continuation of the subject:—" Though I speak with the tongues of men, and of angels, and have not *charity*, I am become as sounding brass or tinkling cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge, and though I have all faith so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am *nothing*."—1 Cor. xiii. 1.

The Apostle above says, " For by one spirit we are all baptized into one body," and yet some members of that body thus baptized were but as " sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal." The privileges to which baptism admits, whether external or internal, are gifts of the Spirit, and great gifts. The Puritan Prayer Book (Waldegrave) in acknowledgment of the greatness of the privilege, directs the minister, after baptism, to say:—

" We give thee most humble thanks for thine infinite goodness which hast not only numbered us among thy Saints, but also of thy free mercy dost call our children unto thee, marking them with *this sacrament as a singular token and seal of thy love.*"

The Baxterian Service contains the following words in the thanksgiving after baptism:—

" We thank thee, most merciful Father, that when we had broken thy law, and were condemned by it, thou hast given us a Saviour, and life in him; and hast extended thy covenant of grace to believers, and to their seed; and *hast now received this child into thy covenant and Church, as a member of Christ by this sacrament of regeneration.*"

And to the same effect are the words of thanksgiving in our service:—" We yield thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased thee to regenerate this infant with thy Holy Spirit, to receive him for thine own child by adoption, and to incorporate him into thy holy Church." The child is accepted as the Baxterian Service sets forth: " *in the covenant of God . . . as a member of Christ and his Church, where he vouchsafeth his protection and provision, and the means, and Spirit of Grace.*"

These privileges are gifts of the Holy Spirit. The child is admitted into a new condition or state, or in other words, regenerated, at least externally, by the Holy Spirit; while at the same time prayer is offered that he may receive "*the fulness of grace.*"

The 26th article of 1553 (now the 25th) expressly rejects the doctrine of *opus operatum* as follows:—

"And in such only as worthily receive the same they have a wholesome effect and operation, and yet not that of the work wrought, as some men speak, which word as it is strange and unknown to holy Scriptnre; so it engendereth no godly but a very superstitious sense. But they that receive the sacrament unworthily purchase to themselves damnation as Saint Paul saith."

The Reformers had before them the Tridentine Canon of 1547, and drew up the article in opposition thereto.

The article itself had been the subject of long and anxious discussion. This fact is stated by Peter Martyr in a letter to Bullinger, June 24, 1552. He says:—

"But the chief reason which prevented the other things which were purposed from being effected was the matter of the sacraments, not truly as regards transubstantiation, or the real presence (so to speak) either in the bread or in the wine; since thanks be to God, concerning these things there seems to be now no controversy as it regards those who profess the Gospel; but whether grace is *conferred* by the sacraments is a point about which many have hesitated. And there have been some who have altogether affirmed that doctrine, and were desirous that a decision should be given to that effect. Concerning which, because others saw how many superstitions that sentence would bring with it, they endeavoured at first in all ways to show that nothing more is to be granted to the sacraments than to the external Word of God."—*Bradford's Letters*, p. 405. P.S.

He adds:—

"Many will have it and those, otherwise, not unlearned nor evil, that grace is *conferred*, as they say, by the sacraments. Nor are they willing to grant that *little children are justified or regenerated before baptism.*"—*Bradford's Works*, p. 405, vol. i. P.S.

The delay occasioned by this difference of opinion was considerable. At length the articles were laid before the Royal Chaplains, of whom John Knox was one, for their approval.

The discussion which had taken place as to *opus operatum* terminated unfavourably to its advocates.

John Knox and Grindal approved by their signature the articles.

The 25th Article was constructed to admit of the opinion that little children may be "justified or regenerated *previous* to baptism." "The Collections of the Church of Scotland" refers to the Directory of 1644, and says:—

"Parents vowing in their name and stead, they do thereby become absolutely bound to the performance thereof, because their obligation and duty to be the Lord's were supposed and previous unto their being baptized."—*Collections of the Church of Scotland in four books.* Edinburgh, 1709.

The same work states that "the children of professing parents are *Christians*, and *federally holy before baptism*."

The express reference to *opus operatum* was omitted in 1562, but the necessity of worthy reception to efficacy was retained. As Bishop Burnet remarks: "There is no real difference, for the virtue of the sacraments being put in the worthy receiving, excludes the doctrine of *opus operatum* as formally as if it had been expressly condemned."—*Exposition of the Articles.*

Moral Renovation.—The possession of the higher blessing, moral renovation, is manifestly hypothetical, or conditional. The following words in the address cannot be received in an absolute sense, and as implying that all who are baptized shall be saved:—"Doubt ye not therefore, but *earnestly believe* that he will likewise favourably receive this present infant, that he will embrace him with the arms of his mercy, that he will give unto him the blessing of *eternal life* and make him partaker of *his everlasting kingdom*." This is the language of earnest hope—a hope, or charitable supposition, which is the foundation of all our services; and it would be as unreasonable to insist that the Church on this ground holds the doctrine of *baptismal salvation*, as of baptismal moral renovation. When we say that the adult, or child, is regenerate, we are required to believe that he is born anew or introduced into a condition of privilege, as a member of Christ's

Church ; and to hope that, in answer to prayer, moral renovation or regeneration, if it have not gone before, will accompany, or follow after this act of covenant.

Summary of Facts.—The following facts show that that the Church does not require her members to believe that every infant undergoes moral renovation by the outward act.

1. The article on the sacraments was framed in opposition to the doctrine of the Council of Trent, defined on this point in 1547, as follows :—

“ If any one saith that by the said sacraments of the new law, grace is not conferred through the act performed (*ex opere operato*) but that faith alone in the divine promise suffices for the obtaining of grace, let him be Anathema.”—*Canon viii, Sess. vii.*

2. Our service was mainly derived from that of Cologne of which Bucer had been the compiler. But Bucer did not hold that every child in baptism undergoes regeneration in the sense of moral renovation : he says :—

“ From these things, it is readily acknowledged, that every true Church of God consists only of the *regenerate*, but nevertheless has for the most part among them *in external communion in sacred things those that are not regenerate*, but their true character concealed, if so be that Christ’s discipline flourishes as it ought.” . . . “ Hence [*i.e.*, from 1 John iii. 14] it is plain that THE TRUE MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH ARE ALONE REGENERATED ” (On the Ephes., p. 560). He refers to regeneration in its full sense.

Bucer in his criticisms of the Prayer Book, did not censure its baptismal language regarding regeneration.

Dr. Mozley remarks that the language of our Baptismal Service was acquiesced in by the most rigid Calvinists of that period (A.D. 1552) without a word of complaint ; that “ the hypothetical interpretation ” was “ dominant ” “ for a century after the Reformation ; that the Laudian School in its full power and highest ascendancy never thought of interfering with it, and that lastly an interpretation which was coeval with the very service itself, was never legally called in question

till the other day, namely, in the Gorham case."—*Review*, p. 355, as before.

3. Our service was approved by Martyr, to whose letter in reference to the articles we have referred. He says: "The Book or Order of Ecclesiastical Rites and the Administration of the Sacraments has been reformed, for *all things have been removed from it which could nourish superstition.*"—*Bradford's Works*, vol. ii, p. 403.

P.S.

Martyr could not have approved the Baptismal Service if it necessitated belief in doctrine, which he regarded as erroneous.

Synodical declarations.—The bishops in the United States, put forth an important declaration, October 13, 1871, which bears directly on this subject. It is as follows:—"We, the subscribers, Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, being asked, in order to the quieting of the consciences of sundry members of our Church, to declare our conviction *as to the meaning of the word 'regenerate' in the office for the ministration of Baptism of Infants*, do declare that in our opinion the word 'regenerate' is *not there so used as to determine that a moral change in the subject of Baptism is wrought in that Sacrament.*" The bishops state that the declaration was passed "after prayer and earnest deliberation." The House of Bishops consisted of fifty-two members; fifty were present, of whom forty-nine signed.—See "McIlvaine's Life" by Carus.

We also call attention to the following passage in the preface to the Revised Prayer Book of the Church of Ireland. Referring to the refusal of the Synod to make any substantial change in the Baptismal Service, the preface proceeds: "At the same time, we desire fully to recognize the liberty of expanding these formulæries hitherto allowed by the general practice of the Church. And as concerning these points whereupon such liberty has been allowed, we hereby further declare, that no minister of this Church is required to

hold or teach any doctrine which has not been clearly determined by the Articles of Religion."

These synodical declarations entirely support the views maintained in this work as to the meaning of the word regeneration, and the liberty allowed by the Church of England.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE MARRIAGE SERVICE.

THE first rubric stands thus in the Sealed Books sanctioned by Act of Uniformity :—

"First the Banns of all that are to be married together, must be published in the Church three several Sundays, or Holy days, in the time of Divine Service, immediately before the sentences for the offertory."

This was modified by Act of Parliament.—See p. 115.

The addresses at the beginning and close of the service :— "Dearly beloved, we are gathered together here," and "All ye that are married," were composed in 1549.

The charge, "I require and charge you both," and the rubric following, with the questions and consent and bethrothal, are modified from the Sarum office.

The Sarum office had a form for the benediction of the ring, when the following prayers were offered :—

"Creator and Preserver of the human race, giver of spiritual grace, the bestower of eternal salvation. Do thou, O Lord, send thy blessing upon *this ring*, that whoever shall bear it may be armed with the virtue of celestial defence, and it may avail him to eternal salvation. Through Christ." "Bless O Lord, *this ring*, which we bless in thy holy name, that whosoever shall bear it may continue in thy peace, and remain in thy will, and live, and advance, and grow old in thy love, and attain to length of days. Through the Lord."

The ring was then sprinkled with holy water, the bridegroom saying—

"With this rynge I the wed, and this gold and silver I the geve, and with my body I the worshipe, and with

all my wordely cathel I the endowe :" while the bridegroom placed the ring on the finger, he said ; at the first, "in the name of the Father ; at the second, in the name of the Son ; at the third, in the name of the Holy Ghost, and the fourth, Amen." This was omitted by the reformers, but the book of 1549 directed the man to "give unto the woman a ring and other tokens of spousage, as gold or silver, laying the same upon the book." This direction was omitted in 1552.

The prayer, " O eternal God," was composed in 1549. Some of its expressions were taken from the prayer of blessing upon the ring, with this difference, that the blessing is invoked upon the person, not the ring.

The joining of hands and the declaration, " Forasmuch as *M.* and *N.* have consented," were composed in 1549, from Herman's " Consultation," or Service.

The blessing, " God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, bless, preserve and keep you," is from the Sarum Manual, with the omission of the cross +.

This was succeeded by the following notice in the book of 1549 :—

" Then shall they go into the quire, and the ministers or clerks shall say or sing this Psalm following."—*Beati omnes, Ps. cxxviii.*

This was altered in 1552 as follows :—

" Then the ministers or clerks, going to the Lord's Table, shall say or sing this Psalm following."

The older rubric was indicative of the distinction between the expousals which took place at the door, and the marriage in the choir. This was abolished in 1552.

The versicles which succeed the Lord's Prayer are derived from the Psalms lxxxvi. 2 ; xx. 1, 2 ; lxi. 3 ; cii. 1.

The three prayers which follow, with the blessing, are taken from the Sarum Manual with the change in 1552, of the words :—" And as thou didst send thy Angel Raphael to Thobie, and Sarah, the daughter of Raquel," to " And as thou didst send thy blessing," &c.

The closing address which is to be read, “if there be no sermon,” was composed in 1549.

The closing rubric until 1661 was as follows:—“The new married persons (the same day of their marriage) *must* receive the Holy Communion.” The Puritans, at the Savoy Conference, rightly objected to the compulsory reception of the Lord’s Supper, by “new married persons.” The word “convenient” therefore was substituted for “must,” and the words “the same day of their marriage,” were altered to “at the time of their marriage, or at the first opportunity after their marriage.”

CHAPTER XVIII.

SECTION I.

THE VISITATION OF THE SICK.

THE office opens with the salutation, Luke x. 5. The Sarum office commenced with the seven penitential Psalms, to be said by the “Priest on his way to the house.”

The prayer, “Remember O Lord,” &c., is entitled the Anthem in the book of 1549; this title was expunged in 1552. The answer, “Spare us good Lord,” was added in 1661.

Until 1661, the Lord’s Prayer was given in the old style as follows:—“Our Father, which art in heaven, &c. And lead us not temptation. *Answer.* But deliver us from evil. *Amen.*”

The versicles are similar to those in the marriage service, with an addition, “Let the enemy have no advantage of him,” with its response from Psalm lxxxix. 22, 23.

The prayer, “Hear us,” was recomposed by our Reformers. The words “And as thou preservedst Thobie and Sarah by thy Angel from danger,” were

omitted in 1552. The prayer was further modified in 1661.

The exhortation, "Dearly beloved," was composed by the Reformers in 1549.

The rubric directing the patient to answer after the creed, "All this I steadfastly believe," was added in 1661.

We quote the following passage as to the rubric relating to Confession and Absolution from "The Book of Common Prayer in its History and Interpretation" (Blakeney, p. 563, 3rd edition) :—

Absolution.—Take a case. A person with a load of guilt upon his conscience who cannot quiet himself, naturally refers to his minister, and in consultation receives from him, as the Homily calls it, "the salve of God's Word," "the quieting of his conscience." In addition to this, he obtains spiritual counsel and advice for his future guidance that he may act without perplexity, (scruple) and doubtfulness, or hesitation.

Wheatly says that the Reformers left out the rubric directing this form to be used in private confession :—

"To show that the benefit of absolution (of absolution, I presume, from inward guilt) was not to be received by the pronouncing of any form, but by a due application and ministry of God's holy word."—*Rat. Illus.*, c. xi, sec. v.

Dr. Phillpotts, late Bishop of Exeter, says :—

"And here again the nature of that particular absolution is distinctly intimated to be of the same kind as the two former instances of general absolution; it is to be exercised (*not by the judicial sentence of the priest after a process carried on before his tribunal, as your Church insists, but*) '*by the ministry of God's holy word; or an authoritative declaration of God's general promises applied in favour of that particular penitent, if he be indeed penitent.*'"—*Letters to C. Butler*, p. 210. Lond., 1826.

There is a marked difference between the rubrics of 1549 and 1552, as appears from the following parallel :—

The First Book.

“Here shall the sick person make a special confession, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which confession the priest shall absolve him after this form: and the same form of absolution shall be used in all private confessions.”

The Book as it is.

“Here shall the sick person be moved to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which confession the priest shall absolve him (*if he humbly and heartily desire it*) after this sort.

1. Even the first Prayer Book in this matter rejected the Romish principle of confession. According to Rome, confession to a priest is necessary. The Romish rubric directs:—

“Then shall the penitent make a general confession in Latin, or the vulgar tongue, namely, the confiteor,” &c.—*Ordo adminis.*, sec. ii. 1831.

This admits of no reservation or exception; a full confession is necessary:—

“If the penitent shall have not expressed the number, kind, and circumstances of his sins, which are all necessary to be unfolded, the priest shall prudently interrogate him.”—*Ibid.*

But the first Prayer Book of King Edward, though allowing auricular confession, struck a blow at its very root, when it prescribed that the sick person shall make a special confession of his sins “*if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter.*”

It was only in this exceptional case of a burdened conscience, that a confession was to be made, evidently not as a necessity but as a relief.

2. Moreover, it was to be special, that is, not having reference to sins in general, but to the *particular* burden of which the penitent complains. Here then is neither fulness, nor necessity, nor secrecy.

3. The Romish Service Book says: “It is indispensable that he (the confessor) keeps the seal of secret confession under an exact and perpetual silence;” but

not only is no such direction given in the service for the Visitation of the Sick, but the service itself implies the presence of other persons besides the minister and penitent. This appears from the responses :—

“Minister : O Lord, save thy servant.

“Answer : Which putteth his trust in thee.”

4. But looking at the above parallel, we see that an important advance has been made.

(a) “Shall make” was altered in 1661 to “shall be *moved* to make.” The one was absolute as applying to that exceptional case; the other is not absolute, but directs that the penitent shall be exhorted to “open his grief.”

(b) The word “*form*” was altered in 1552 to “*sort*.” The priest according to the rubric need not use the exact form. He may say, for instance, “I declare thee absolved,” &c.

The direction that this absolution was to be used in private confessions was wholly omitted in 1552, and the words “if he humbly and heartily desire it” were inserted in 1661.—*See parallel above.*

The first part of the Absolution : “Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to his Church, to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in him, of his great mercy forgive thee thine offences,” was composed by our Reformers. The latter part, “And by his authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen,” was a recast of the older form.

The mediæval absolution was the following :—

“Our Lord Jesus Christ of his great goodness absolve thee; and I by the authority of the same our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, and by the authority delivered to me, absolve thee from all the sins for which thou art contrite in heart, and with the mouth hast confessed to me: And from all thy other sins which thou wert willing freely to confess if they had occurred to thy memory: and I restore thee to the sacraments of the Church. In the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Amen.”

There are very important differences between the Roman and Anglican forms. (1) The Roman implies

the necessity of confession to a priest who absolves from all the sins which the penitent had confessed to him, and which he was willing to confess, but may have forgotten. This was rejected by the Reformers. (2) The Roman formula applies the absolution of the priest both to forgiveness of sin, and *restitution* to the sacraments. The Anglican formula does not express this distinction, but so employs its terms, in such a general way, that it may apply to sins as committed against the Church, which was the original intention of the indicative form, in the loosing of Church censures incurred either *de facto*, or formally.

There is good reason to believe that the absolution was retained with this view.—See p. 192.

The prayer, “O most merciful God,” which follows, exists in the liturgy of Gelasius, A.D. 494, and in the formularies of the Anglo-Saxon Church. It was itself originally a form of absolution. Alphonsus Liguori, the Romish saint, says: “Many weighty authorities hold that formerly absolution was deprecatory, May God absolve thee, until the middle of the 12th century, and which also is in use in this day in the Greek Church.”—*Moral Theol.*, p. 7, vol. vi. Venice, 1828.

Morinus, the Roman theologian, has collected numerous absolutions used in the early ages, all of which are precatory.

Marshall, in his appendix, gives specimens of the forms collected by Morinus. The above prayer, “O most merciful God,” is amongst them.

The petition, “O Saviour of the world,” is taken from the Sarum Manual.

The benediction, “the Almighty Lord,” was composed by the Reformers in 1549.

The committal, “Unto God’s gracious mercy,” in the latter portion, is founded on the blessing in Numb. vi. It was added in 1661.

The Sarum formula presents a striking contrast to the above.

The four concluding prayers were added in 1661.

SECTION II.

COMMUNION OF THE SICK.

The book of 1549 permitted the reservation of the consecrated elements for the sick, "if the same day there be a celebration of the Holy Communion," but it allowed the consecration of the elements in the house "if the day be not appointed for the open communion in the church." In 1552 reservation was withdrawn.

The collect, "Almighty, everliving God," was composed in 1549.

The first of the concluding rubrics, directing the minister after the Epistle and Gospel to begin at the words "Ye that do truly," &c., was composed in 1552.

It is observable that the offertory is omitted.

The second formed the first paragraph in the first of the concluding rubrics in the book of 1549, and was recast in 1552.

Reception in the Holy Communion by faith.—The third rubric was composed in 1549, the words being added in 1552, "or for lack of company to receive with him," and the omission in 1552 of the word "spiritually" after the word drink. This rubric proves that, in the view of the Church, a person in such a case "may eat and drink the body and blood of our Saviour Christ profitably to his soul's health, although he do not receive the sacrament with his mouth," or, in other words, that the feeding on Christ is a spiritual action, of which the Lord's Supper is the sign or seal. The word "spiritually" was omitted in 1552, lest it might be supposed that though the communicant in that case feeds spiritually, he does not feed fully.

It is remarkable that the Sarum office contained an address to communicants, who are unable to partake, of which the following is a translation:—"Brother, in this case *true faith suffices* for thee and a good will: *only believe, and thou hast eaten.*" This only illustrates the fact that the office was older than transubstantiation. The famous words *tantum crede et manducasti* are those

of Augustine, who says:—"For what purpose dost thou prepare thy teeth and belly? *Believe and thou hast eaten.*"—*Tract xxv, on John vi.*

SECTION III.

ABSOLUTION AND SCRIPTURE.

Scripture Teaching.—There are two texts which specially bear on this subject: "Verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven. And whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (Matt. xviii. 18). "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whose soever sins ye retain they are retained."—*John xx. 23.*

These words were addressed to the Apostles as the founders of the Church, but are applicable to ministers to the end of time.—*Matt. xxviii. 20.*

But there is obviously a sense in which they apply to the Apostles especially. They were guided by the plenary inspiration of the Holy Spirit. They were empowered by the Holy Ghost to unfold Christian truth, and to settle the constitution of the Christian Church. The Holy Spirit was to show them "things to come" (John xvi. 13). Whatsoever doctrine, after the effusion of the Spirit, they taught was infallibly true, and as such absolute in its obligation. Whatever ceremonial observance they abrogated, was completely null and void. Thus, whatsoever they bound on earth was bound, or sanctioned in heaven; and whatsoever they loosed on earth, was loosed in heaven. They bound upon men what they were to believe: they loosed the Church from Judaical observances.

In the Epistle to the Romans, St. Paul shows that the law is no longer obligatory, and propounds the doctrines of the Christian faith. In the Galatians he repudiates "the weak and beggarly elements" of the world—Judaical Ritualism,—and binds upon his

converts what they were to believe. The Apostles propounded the plan of salvation; they showed how sin is to be remitted, and all their teaching received the sanction of heaven: this was *peculiar* to them. Their office was extraordinary, and in its fulness ceased to exist.

Dr. Newman admits that the Apostles possessed powers which even the Popes do not inherit. He says:—

“This remark, and several before it, will become intelligible if we consider that *neither Pope nor Council are on a level with the Apostles*. To the Apostles the whole Revelation was given, by the Church it is transmitted; no simply new truth has been given to us since St. James’s death; the one office of the Church is to guard ‘that noble deposit of truth,’ as St. Paul speaks to Timothy, which the Apostles bequeathed to her in its fulness and integrity.”—*Letter to the Duke of Norfolk*, p. 116. Lond., 1875.

But, as we shall see, neither the teaching, nor the practice, of the Apostles gives any support to the Roman theory.

There is no doubt that God does remit sin by human instrumentality, but the question is, *How*, or by what means?

Roman theory.—The Church of Rome teaches that the remission is conveyed to the contrite, or attrite, through a certain form of words pronounced by the priest. The following is the doctrine of the Council of Trent:—

“That the form of the sacrament of penance, in which especially its virtue consists, is placed in these words of the minister: ‘I absolve thee,’ &c. to which, indeed, according to the custom of the holy Church, some prayers are laudably joined.”—*Chap. iii.*

The words of Christ in the text, apart from other passages, express no condition whatever. If understood according to the letter, they placed in the hands of the Apostles an unreserved amnesty—the power of life and death. But the Church of Rome does not, she could not, venture so far. She stops short of the absolute and literal sense, holding that without contrition, or at least attrition, and confession, absolution is invalid.

So also Mr. Sadler states that "absolution of course can only be a means of grace to sincere penitents" ("Church Doctrine," p. 236); that it is "a conditional power" (*ibid.*, p. 233); that it is "limited to those who repent and believe in Jesus Christ" (*ibid.*, p. 248). And yet he assumes that the sense, which he attributes to the words of Christ, is "the plain meaning of the words" (p. 232), and that as Christ forgave the man sick of the palsy "this delegated power he in his turn gave to the Apostles" (p. 231). He adds that "any form of absolution which honours these words of Christ, by not taking from them as well as by not adding to them, *must* contain the three words, 'I absolve thee.' No prayer that the person may be absolved by God, as the Absolution in the Holy Communion, fully satisfies these words of Christ" (p. 249). This is the Tridentine opinion, *see* p. 188. The argument fails altogether. Mr. Sadler himself does not receive the words of Christ literally, but limits them by conditions which the words themselves do not express, and attaches to them a meaning which is refuted by fact. The words "I absolve thee," which, with the Council of Trent, he holds to be essential, were not used in the Church until more than a thousand years after Christ, and when first introduced were designed for the remission of Church censures. *His principle leads logically to the conclusion that the Primitive Church did not honour the words of Christ.*—*See* p. 194.

There is nothing in Scripture to support the Roman view, now advocated by Mr. Sadler and others, that a certain form of words in absolution is the Divine channel of forgiveness. The practice of the Apostles is totally against it, but is in perfect harmony with the doctrine of the Church of England that sins are remitted by the Word of God. The Apostles remitted sins, not by the form of words "I absolve thee," but by preaching the Word. The special formula which he regards as essential was not in existence, as we have said, in the Primitive Church.

How the Apostles remitted sins.—We cite two of the numerous examples which might be given of the way in which the Apostles remitted sin.

“Be it known unto you, therefore, men and brethren, that through *this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins*, and by Him all that believe are justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses” (Acts xiii. 38, 39). In answer to the inquiry, “What must I do to be saved?” they said, “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved” (Acts xvi. 31). Nor was it ever supposed that they possessed the power of forgiveness. Peter having exhorted Simon Magus to repentance, Simon said, “*Pray ye to the Lord for me.*”—*Acts viii. 24.*

Persons are often represented as doing what they are the *means* of doing. “They that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and *they that turn many to righteousness* as the stars, for ever and ever” (Daniel xii. 3). It cannot be argued from this, that there is a power in man to turn the sinner to righteousness. The same observation applies to the following texts: “If by any means I may provoke to emulation them that are my flesh and might *save some of them*” (Romans xi. 14). “I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means *save some*” (1 Corinthians ix. 22). In 1 Corinthians vii. 16, the Apostle speaks of the husband *saving* the wife, and the wife the husband. In 1 Timothy iv. 16, he speaks of Timothy *saving himself, and them that hear him*. In James v. 19, 20, he speaks of a Christian *converting a sinner, and saving a soul*. Jude, writing to the saints, commands them *to save some with fear*, 23rd verse.

Three kinds of absolution.—The word *absolve* is derived from *absalvo*, which signifies to loose from or untie. There are three kinds of absolution, *declaratory, precatory, and ecclesiastical*.

Declaratory.—1. The absolution in the beginning of the Morning and Evening Services is declaratory. Its opening statement, with the exception of a passage in

the Homilies, is the only document in which the Church of England lays down her doctrine of absolution. It teaches that ministers are empowered to pronounce and declare (the word "pronounce" implying that he does so as a herald) the absolution and remission of sins to the penitent; and then it announces that, "He" (Almighty God) "pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly repent and unfeignedly believe His holy Gospel." The minister absolves by declaring that God absolves. The Church of England does not teach, as Rome teaches, that absolution is judicial, and the appointed channel of forgiveness; but that absolution is declarative, for the minister as a herald declares that God pardons the penitent. The Church of Rome, in her Tridentine Canon, anathematizes those who say that absolution is a ministry of pronouncing and declaring—"pronuntiandi et declarandi"—that sins are remitted.* That the Church of England does not regard this absolution as conveying, *per se*, forgiveness to the soul, is evident from the fact, that in the very same form, she invites the people to repentance, and, throughout the service which follows, beseeches pardon and forgiveness. Her services ought to be interpreted according to this doctrine, profounded by herself.

Jewel the champion of the Church says:—

"Moreover that Christ's disciples did receive this authority, *not that they should hear private confessions of the people, and listen to their whisperings, as the common massing priests do* everywhere now-a-days, and do it so as though in that one point lay all the virtue and use of the Keys: but to the end they shall *go*, they should *teach*, they should *publish abroad the Gospel*, and be unto the believing a sweet savour of life unto life, and unto the unbelieving and unfaithful, a savour of death unto death; and that the minds of godly persons being brought low by the remorse of their former life and errors, after they once began to look up

* The Canon in full is as follows:—"If any one shall say, that the sacramental absolution of the priest is not a judicial act, but a bare ministerial act of pronouncing and declaring to the person confessing, that his sins are forgiven, provided only he believes himself to be absolved; or if the priest does not seriously absolve him, but only in joke, or shall say that the confession of the penitent is not required for absolution, let him be accursed."—*Canon ix, Sess. 14.*

into the light of the gospel, and believe in Christ, might be opened *with the Word of God* even as a door is opened with a key: contrariwise that the wicked and wilful folk, and such as would not believe, nor return into the right way, should be left still, as fast locked, and shut up, and as St. Paul saith, wax worse and worse. This take we to be the meaning of the Keys; and that after this sort men's consciences be either to be opened or shut."—*Defence of Apology*, p. 151. London, 1609.

Jewel refers also to excommunication, and absolution from the same, as an exercise of the keys.

Precatory.—2. The next absolution is in the Communion Service, and is *precatory*, being put in the form of a prayer: "Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who, of his great mercy, hath promised forgiveness of sins to all them that with hearty repentance and true faith turn unto him; have mercy upon you; pardon and deliver you from all your sins; confirm and strengthen you in all goodness, and bring you to everlasting life, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

Ecclesiastical.—3. The third absolution occurring in the service for the Visitation of the Sick, is ecclesiastical. Man can forgive sins committed against himself, and so the Church can remit her censures inflicted because of sins. The Corinthians in obedience to apostolic direction cut off from communion the erring brother (1 Cor. v. 3, 5). But, in due time, they loosed the bonds of ecclesiastical censure, or, to use the technical term, they absolved him—"Sufficient to such a man is this punishment which was inflicted of many . . . to whom ye forgive anything I forgive also" (2 Cor. ii. 10). The Church of England refers to this absolution when she says:—"Christ ordained the authority of the keys to excommunicate notorious sinners, and to absolve them which are truly penitent." *The second part of the sermon for Whitsunday.*

The Church, as a society, possesses the power of cutting off unworthy members from Church communion, and of inflicting other penalties. This arises from the nature of the case, and is claimed as a right by every Christian community. According to the 109th Canon,

the churchwardens* should present the names of evildoers to the ordinary with a view to ecclesiastical censure. This power, it is true, is now dormant in the Church; but its dormancy does not affect the right or the theory of the case. Our services were drawn up in the contemplation of such discipline. The excommunicate, as the word itself implies, is not to be a partaker of the Lord's Supper, or of other Christian privileges.

The minister in the Visitation of the Sick is to endeavour by judicious questions to find out the state of his soul,—whether, as the rubric says, “he repents him truly of his sins,” and is in charity with all the world; exhorting him to forgive those who had offended him, and to ask forgiveness of those whom he had offended making amends as far as in him lies. Then if his conscience be “troubled with any weighty matter”—if there be some burden on his mind which threatens to disturb the peace of his last moments—he is to be “moved to make a special confession of his sins;” with a view to absolution, “if he humbly and heartily desire it,” by which he is set free from any censure to which he might have rendered himself liable. Accord-

* The 113th Canon ordains that *ministers* may present, but wisely provides, lest this should operate as a bar to the confidential intercourse of a pastor with his flock, that “if any man confess his secret and hidden sins to the minister, *for the unburdening of his conscience, and to receive spiritual consolation and ease of mind from him*,” the minister shall not reveal the same, “*except they be such crimes as by the laws of this realm his own life may be called into question for concealing the same.*” This canon was wisely framed. A clergyman visiting his flock, or giving spiritual consolation to those who seek his advice in spiritual distress, should not be at liberty to present persons for punishment on knowledge communicated confidentially. This canon lays the axe at the root of auricular confession, for it allows the minister to divulge the secret committed to him, when his own life may be called into question. Rome imposes silence upon the confessor even when his own life, or the interest of a whole community, is at stake. This canon relates to *ministerial guidance*, but not to auricular confession. See the words as quoted above in italics from the canon showing the object for which such sins are disclosed.

ingly, in the prayer that follows absolution, the minister says, "Preserve and *continue* this sick member in the unity of the Church."*

In the primitive Church, confession of sin was made publicly; notorious offenders were excommunicated, or cut off from Church privileges, and after a period of penitential probation, re-admitted to the Church. The removal of such censures was the absolution. Wheatly says:—

"If we look into her practice for the first four centuries we shall always find absolution co-relative to public discipline."—*On the Common Prayer*, p. 434. London, 1842.

Prayer was offered up for the penitent; God's pardon was thus sought for him, and by imposition of hands he was restored. Thus absolution was precatory. But gradually this public confession gave place to private, in compliance with the wishes of a corrupt age. The notion that the minister, by an absolving form, can forgive sins, was later in its introduction than many other dogmas of Rome.

The indicative form of absolution (that in which the minister speaks in the first person singular, saying "I absolve") was not introduced until the 12th century.—See p. 185.

Alexander Halensis, called the irrefragable doctor, explains its purpose. Speaking of the two parts of the absolution, and of the office of priest, as a suppliant and superior, he says:—

"In the first way, he is qualified for obtaining grace by his supplication on the sinner's behalf. In the second way, *his province is reconciling the sinner to the Church*. In token of this there is premised to the formulary of absolution, a prayer, by way of deprecation, and then absolution itself follows, which is pronounced indicatively. The prayer obtains it; the absolution itself *pre-supposes* the grace of forgiveness, since the priest would never absolve but on the presumption that the party was *already absolved by God*."—4 Part. sum. Quæst. 21, p. 339. *Venit ap Franciscum*, fol. 1575.

* This expression "unity of the Church," is used in the 33rd Article:—"That person which by open denunciation of the Church is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church," &c.

Alexander Halensis lived in the 13th century, which makes his statement the more remarkable.

According to his view the following points are plain :—

1. The priest obtains grace, the grace of forgiveness by *prayer*. This he does as a suppliant.

2. As a superior or judge he reconciles the penitent to the Church. It is only in reference to ecclesiastical offences that he is judge. In the pardon of sin he is a suppliant. What the Church imposes, the Church may authoritatively by its officer, withdraw. The absolution, therefore, is indicative.

3. The efficacy is attributed to the prayer, not to the indicative form. The very opposite is the teaching of the Council of Trent according to which the efficacy is placed in the words “I absolve thee.”—*Sess. xiv, c. 3.*

4. The absolution pre-supposes that the sinner has been already absolved by God, which is the very opposite of Roman teaching, according to which God’s absolution is conveyed by the absolution of the priest.

From this quotation it is evident that, even in the 13th century, the modern dogma of absolution was not held by divines in communion with Rome, and that the indicative form then introduced was intended for the reconciliation of penitents to the Church. It was not until a hundred years after, that the same form was used by authority in private confessions. Cardinal Othobon held a National Synod in London, A.D. 1268, in which it was ordained that “all who heard confessions should absolve those who confessed according to the following form :”—

“I, by the authority which I exercise, absolve thee from thy sins.”—*Constit. Dom. Othobon in Council, Angl., A.D. 1268. Apud Lyndwood*, p. 81. Paris, 1506.

From that time forth, the notion prevailed that the priest forgives sins, but still the dogma was not fixed definitely until the Council of Trent, A.D. 1564.

It is evident that our Reformers retained this absolu-

tion according to its original use. In the collect which immediately follows the minister prays:—"Preserve and continue this sick member in the unity of the Church." Moreover, this collect is substantially taken from the *penitential* of Ecbert, Archbishop of York, in which it was provided for clerical, or sick bed absolution, in the restoration of the sick to the unity of the Church, as well as in supplication for God's pardon.

The absolution restores the penitent to Church communion, and, therefore, our Reformers, instead of saying—"Restore him to the unity of thy Church," as it was in the collect of Ecbert (in whose time there was no indicative form of absolution), provided a prayer that he may be *preserved and continued* in the unity of the Church to which he had been just restored.

In the Kirk of Scotland, the following form is used:—

" Sentence of absolution.

" Whereas thou, A B, hast been shut out for thy sin from the congregation of the faithful, and hast now manifested thy repentance, wherein the Church resteth satisfied: in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, before the congregation, I pronounce and declare thee absolved from the sentence of excommunication formerly pronounced against thee, and do receive thee into the communion of the Church, and the free use of all the ordinances of Christ, that thou mayest be partaker of all his benefits to thy eternal Salvation."—*Writs and Forms of procedure in the Church Courts of Scotland*, p. 123. See Collections, as before.

That the absolution is not regarded by the Church as the medium of Divine pardon is evident from the fact that the use of *the service for the Visitation of the Sick is optional*, for the 67th Canon allows the preacher considerable liberty:—

" When any person is dangerously sick in any parish, the minister or curate having knowledge thereof, shall resort unto him or her (if the disease be not known, or probably suspected, to be infectious), to instruct and comfort them in their distress, according to the order of the Communion Book, if he be no preacher; or if he be a preacher, then as he shall think most needful and convenient."

Now, if absolution were in the eye of the Church the channel of Divine forgiveness, it ought to be *universal* in its use. Instead of being *the exception*, as it is in the rubric, or at the *discretion* of the minister, as it is left by the canon, its use ought to be the rule, and so

*obligatory that no minister could dare to withhold from the penitent the Divine medium of pardon.**

Further, the Church of England preaches against Sacramental or “*Auricular confession.*” The 35th Article declares that the Homilies contain “a godly and wholesome doctrine.”

The Homily on repentance, referring to James v. 16, says:—

“And, whereas, the adversaries go about to wrest this place, for to maintain their auricular confession withal, *they are greatly deceived themselves, and do shamefully deceive others;* for if this text ought to be understood of auricular confession, then the priests are as much bound to confess themselves unto the lay-people as the lay-people are bound to confess themselves to them. And if to pray is to absolve, then the laity by this place hath as great authority to absolve the priests as the priests have to absolve the laity.”

Referring to the words of Ambrose, the same Homily speaks in the following plain and forcible language:—

“Therefore, Holy Ambrose, in his second sermon, upon the Hundred and Nineteenth Psalm, doth say full well, ‘*Go, show thyself unto the priest.*’ Who is the true priest, but He which is the Priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedeck? Whereby, this holy father doth understand, that both the priesthood and the law being changed, we ought to acknowledge *none other priest for deliverance from our sins, but our Saviour Jesus Christ, who being our sovereign bishop, doth, with the sacrifice of His body and blood, offered once for ever upon the altar of the cross, most effectually cleanse the spiritual leprosy, and wash away the sins of all those that, with true confession of the same, do flee unto Him.*’”

* It was customary to describe the remission of Church censures as an absolution from sins. Thus John Knox in his book of *Common Order* prescribed the following words in the form for the removal of censures, “and pronounce thy sins to be loosed in Heaven.” The *Westminster Confession*, a century later, teaches that officers of the Church “*remit and retain sins,*” or open the kingdom of Heaven “unto penitent sinners by the ministry of the

It concludes this subject with a judicious reference to the lawful communications of pastor and flock:—

“I do not say but that, if any do find themselves troubled in conscience, they may repair to their learned curate or pastor, or to some other godly learned man, and show the trouble and doubt of their conscience to them, that they may receive at their hand the comfortable salve of God’s Word; *but it is against the true Christian liberty, that any man should be bound to the numbering of his sins*, as it hath been used heretofore in the time of *blindness and ignorance*.”—*Second Part of Homily on Repentance.*

CHAPTER XIX.

SECTION I.

THE BURIAL OF THE DEAD.

THE first rubric was inserted in 1661.

The service opens with passages of Scripture appropriate to the occasion. The Psalms (cxvi., cxxxix., cxlv.) were appointed in the book of 1549, “with other suffrages following to be said in the Church, either before or after the burial of the corpse.” These Psalms were omitted in 1552. Psalms xxxix. and xc. were inserted in 1661.

The prayer which is to be said “when they come to the grave” consists of four paragraphs.

The first—“man that is born”—is taken from Job xiv. 1.

The second—“in the midst of life,” and the third—“yet O Lord,” are taken from the old Lenten service.

The fourth—“thou knowest Lord”—borrows some of its expressions from the same source.

Gospel, and by absolution from censures,” and “shut that kingdom against the impenitent both by word and censures.” (xxx, c.) Thus the absolution from censures, and restoration to Church privileges are described as a forgiveness of sin. The Church of Rome issues indulgences to parties for the remission and pardon of all their sins, by which she does not refer to the eternal guilt of sin, but its temporal punishment in this life or in purgatory.

We place the committal, as it is, in parallel columns with the committal, as it was, in the book of 1549.

As it is 1662.

1549.

Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God of his great mercy to take unto himself the soul of our dear brother here departed, we therefore commit his body to the ground, earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust; in sure and certain hope of the resurrection, &c.

The reader can at once see that the present form rejects prayer for the dead.

The concluding prayer and collect are derived from the book of 1549; the former from the Burial Service, the latter from the Communion Service following the Burial.

SECTION II.

PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD.

The Church of England rejects prayer for the dead.— This appears from a comparison of the Prayer Book of 1549 with the Prayer Book of 1662, in the *Communion Service*.

The Book of 1549.

“We commend unto thy mercy (O Lord) all other thy servants, which are departed hence from us, with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the sleep of peace: Grant unto them, we beseech thee, thy mercy, and everlasting peace, and that, at the day of the general resurrection, we and all they which be of the mystical body of thy Son, may altogether be set on his right hand, and hear that his most joyful voice: Come unto me, O ye that be blessed of my Father, and possess the kingdom, which is prepared for you from the beginning of the world: grant this, O Father, for Jesus Christ’s sake, our only Mediator and Advocate.”

The Book as it is.

“And we also bless thy holy name for all thy servants departed this life in thy faith and fear, beseeching thee to give us grace so to follow their good examples, that with them we may be partakers of thy heavenly kingdom.” — *Prayer for the Church Militant.*

Bucer objected to prayer for the dead, and suggested another formula in the prayer *for the whole Church*. This fact is noticed, as follows, in Notes, attributed to Bishop Cosin, which state that Bucer desires

"That instead of this commendation and prayer for the dead, another clause might be substituted, to beseech Almighty God, that we, following the holy example of his saints, in the constant profession of our faith and obedience, may, together with them, and all others departed in the faith of Christ, at his second coming, have a glorious resurrection, &c., which is now used in the form of bidding the prayers before sermon, and in the burial of the dead."—*Nicholls' Additional Notes*, p. 52.

Prayer for the dead was omitted in 1552, but the clause suggested by Bucer was not introduced, though the burial service, as revised in 1552, retained the petition "that we with this our brother and all other departed in the true faith of Thy holy name may have our perfect consummation and bliss both in body and soul in Thy eternal and everlasting glory." Bucer's suggestion, however, was carried into effect in 1661, when the prayer in the Communion Service was brought to its present form.

The bidding prayer contains the following passage:—

"Finally, let us *praise* God for all those which are departed out of this life in the faith of Christ, and pray unto God that we have grace to direct our lives after their good example; that this life ended, we may be made partakers with them of the glorious resurrection."

Thanksgiving for those who have died in the faith, including prayer that we "with them" "may have our perfect consummation and bliss both in body and soul," is very different from prayer *for* the dead. We pray that we may share the perfect bliss of the Church of Christ in the day of the resurrection, but the very title of the prayer excludes prayer for the dead—"A prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church **MILITANT HERE ON EARTH.**"—See "Whitgift's Explanation," p. 206.

Wheatly says, in reference to the book of 1549, and Bucer's suggestion:—

"And with this intent a petition for the deceased was continued by our Reformers, in this very prayer of which we are now discoursing, in the first Common Prayer Book of King Edward VI. But this, with a larger thanksgiving for the examples of the saints

than what we now use, was left out of the second book on the exceptions of Bucer and Calvin, and the words *militant here on earth* were added to the exhortation—let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church—in order to *limit the prayer to the living only.*"—*In loco.*

*Burial Service, Book
of 1549.*

"Then the priest casting earth upon the corpse, shall say,

"*I commend thy soul to God the Father Almighty,* and thy body to the ground, earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust, in sure and certain hope of resurrection to eternal life, through our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile body, that it may be like to his glorious body, according to the mighty working whereby he is able to subdue all things to himself.

"Then shall be said or sung,

"I heard a voice from heaven, saying unto me: Write, blessed are the dead which die in the Lord. Even so, saith the Spirit, that they rest from their labours. Apoc. xiv.

"Let us pray,

"*We commend into thy hands of mercy, most merciful Father, the soul of this our brother departed, N.* And his body we commit

*Burial Service, Book
as it is.*

Then while the earth shall be cast upon the body, by some standing by, the Priest shall say,

Forasmuch as it hath pleased almighty God of his great mercy to take unto himself the soul of our dear brother here departed: we therefore commit his body to the ground, earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust, in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life, through our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall change our vile body that it may be like unto his glorious body, according to the mighty working whereby he is able to subdue all things to himself.

¶ Then shall be said or sung.

I heard a voice from heaven, saying unto me, Write: from henceforth, blessed are the dead which die in the Lord: even so saith the Spirit, for they rest from their labours.

* * * *

to the earth, beseeching thine infinite goodness, to give us grace to live in thy fear and love, and to die in thy favour; that when the judgment shall come which thou hast committed to thy well beloved Son, *both this our brother*, and we, may be found acceptable in thy sight, and receive that blessing, which thy well beloved Son shall then pronounce to all that love and fear thee, saying, *Come, ye blessed children of my Father: Receive the kingdom prepared for you before the beginning of the world.* Grant this, merciful Father, for the honour of Jesus Christ our only Saviour, Mediator, and Advocate. Amen.

“This prayer shall also be added.

“Almighty God, we give thee hearty thanks for this thy servant, whom thou hast delivered from the miseries of this wretched world, from the body of death and all temptation; and, as we trust, hast brought his soul, which he committed into thy holy hands, into sure consolation and rest; Grant, we beseech thee, that at the

The Priest. Almighty God, with whom do live spirits of them that depart hence in the Lord, and with whom the souls of the faithful after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity. We give thee hearty thanks, for that it hath pleased thee to deliver this our brother out of the miseries of this sinful world: beseeching thee, that it may please thee of thy gracious goodness, shortly to accomplish the number of thine elect, and to hasten thy kingdom, that we with all those that are departed in the true faith of thy holy name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in thy eternal and everlasting glory through Christ our Lord. Amen.

day of judgment *his soul*
and all the souls of thy
elect, departed out of this
life, may with us, and we
with them, fully receive
thy promises, and be made
perfect altogether, through
the glorious resurrection of
thy Son Jesus Christ our
Lord."

The Church of England teaches, in the following
prayers and other places, that the righteous enter at
once into the bliss of heaven.

"Almighty God, with whom do live the spirits of them
that depart hence in the Lord, and with whom the souls
of the faithful after they are delivered from the burden of
the flesh are in joy and felicity."—*Burial Service*.

"Or else receive him into those *heavenly habitations*,
where the souls of them that sleep in the Lord Jesus
enjoy perpetual *rest* and *felicity*."—*Visitation of the
Sick*. A prayer for a sick child.

"So fit and prepare him, we beseech thee, against
the hour of death, that *after his departure hence in
peace*, and in thy favour, *his soul may be received
into thine everlasting kingdom*."—*Ibid*. A prayer for
a sick person when there appeareth small hope of his
recovery.

"O Almighty God, with whom do live the spirits of
just men made perfect, after they are delivered from
their earthly prisons; we humbly commend the soul of
this thy servant, our dear brother, into thy hands, as
into the hands of a faithful Creator and most merciful
Saviour; most humbly beseeching thee that it may be
precious in thy sight. Wash it, we pray thee, in the
blood of that Immaculate Lamb, that was slain to take
away the sins of the world, that whatsoever defilements
it may have contracted in the midst of this miserable
and naughty world, through the lusts of the flesh or
the wiles of Satan, being purged and done away, it may

be presented pure and without spot before thee.”—*Ibid.*
A commendatory prayer.

The prayer thus recognizes the truth that, washed in the blood of Christ, the soul is “presented pure and without spot” before God.

The Homilies are express on the same subject:—

“Now to entreat of that question, Whether we ought to pray for them that are departed out of this world or no? Wherein, if we will cleave only unto the Word of God, then must we needs grant, that we have no commandment so to do. For the Scripture doth acknowledge *but two places after this life*: the one proper to the elect and blessed of God, the other to the reprobate and damned souls; as may be well gathered by the parable of Lazarus and the rich man: which place St. Augustine’s expounding, saith in this wise, ‘That which Abraham speaketh unto the rich man in Luke’s Gospel, namely, that the just cannot go unto those places where the wicked are tormented, what other things doth it signify, but only this, that the just, by reason of God’s judgment, which may not be revoked, can show no deed of mercy in helping them which after this life are cast into prison, until they pay the uttermost farthing! These words, as they confound the opinion of helping the dead by prayer, so they do clean, confute and take away the vain error of purgatory, which is grounded upon the saying of the Gospel, *Thou shalt not depart thence until thou hast paid the uttermost farthing.* . . . Let these and such other places be sufficient to take away the gross error of purgatory out of our heads; neither let us dream any more that the souls of the dead are anything at all holpen by our prayers: but, as the Scripture teacheth us, let us think that *the soul of man, passing out of the body, goeth straightways either to heaven, or else to hell, whereof the one needeth no prayer, and the other is without redemption.*’—*The third part of the Sermon concerning Prayer.*

VIEWS OF THE REFORMERS.

Cranmer says :—

“ The Scripture maketh mention of *two* places where the dead be received after this life, of Heaven and of Hell ; but of Purgatory is not one word spoken.”—*Works*, p. 181, vol. ii. P.S.

Latimer says :—

“ For you must understand that there are but *two* places appointed of Almighty God for all mankind ; that is Heaven and Hell. And in what state soever a man dieth in, in the same he shall rise again ; for there shall be no alteration or change.”—*Remains*, p. 191. P.S.

Bradford says :—

“ Whereby we may well see, if we will, that as prayer for the dead is not available or profitable for the dead, so it is not of us allowable, or to be exercised.”—*Letters*, p. 279. P.S.

Hooper says :—

“ Neither in the Word of God is there any more mention than of two places, the right hand for the good in Christ, the left hand for the ill ; Abraham’s bosom for the one, a place of joy ; hell for the other, a place of pain.”—*Early Writings*, p. 567. P.S.

Grindal says :—

“ For it is confessed of all men that, if there be no third place, prayer for the dead is in vain : for those that be in Heaven need it not ; those that be in hell can not be holpen by it : so that it needeth not, or booteth not, as the old proverb goeth.”—*Remains*, p. 25. P.S.

Sandys says :—

“ Neither Purgatory, *nor Prayer*, neither any other after helps can be available for the party departed.”—*Sermons*, p. 163. P.S.

Becon says :—

“ For the faithful depart *straightways* unto glory, and the unfaithful unto everlasting pain. The one sort have no need of prayer, for they be already in most blessed state and joyful rest ; and the other are in so damnable case, that prayer can do no good for them.”—*Sick Man’s Salve*, p. 129, vol. ii. P.S.

Coverdale says :—

“ For as they that are departed are *past* our prayers, being either in joy or in misery, as is above showed ; even so we, having for it no word of God, whereupon faith leaneth, can not but sin in doing it, in that we do it not of faith, because we have no word of God for it.”—*Remains*, p. 258. P.S.

Bullinger, in his *Decades* sanctioned by Convocation, says:—

“I know well enough that the written doctrines of the Apostles no where command prayers for the dead, and *in no place allow them.*”—*Sermon X*, p. 396, vol. iv. P.S.

Whitgift, in answer to Cartwright, says:—

“In saying that these words gathered out of some of the prayers, ‘that we with this our brother,’ &c., import prayer for the dead, you do but quarrel: when we say that we, with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, may reign in thy kingdom, do we pray for Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, or rather wish ourselves to be where they are?

“In like manner when we say ‘that we with this our brother and all other departed in the true faith of thy holy name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss both in body and soul,’ we pray not for our brother and other that be departed in the true faith, but we pray *for ourselves*, ‘that we may have our perfect consummation and bliss,’ as we are sure those shall have which die in the true faith.”—*Works*, p. 365, vol. iii. P.S.

CHAPTER XX.

SECTION I.

THE CHURCHING OF WOMEN.

In the book of 1549, this service was entitled—“the Order of the Purification of Women.” The title was changed to its present form in 1552, in order to disassociate it from the Jewish service of purification.

The rubric of the book of 1549 directs the woman “to kneel down in some convenient place nigh unto the quire door.” In 1552, the words “wherc the table standeth” were substituted for “the quire door.” This again was altered in 1661 to the present form “in some convenient place, as hath been accustomed, or as the ordinary shall direct,” a change which admits of greater freedom.

The book of 1549 requires the woman to “offer her chrisom,” or white dress to put on the infant in baptism. This was omitted in 1552.

It was customary in Romish times for women to wear a white covering or veil. The rule of our rubric is simply that she should be “ decently apparelled.”

The address :—“ Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God of his great mercy ”—was composed by the Reformers.

The revision of 1662 superseded the 121st Psalm by the 116th and the 127th.

It is remarkable that though the service, as amended by the Reformers in 1552, was entitled “ the *Thanksgiving* of Women after Childbirth, commonly called the Churching of Women,” it contained no words of thanksgiving prayer. This want was supplied in 1661, when the opening words of the closing prayer—(“ O Almighty God, which has delivered this woman thy servant from the great pain and peril of childbirth ”)—were recomposed as follows :—“ O Almighty God, we give thee *humble thanks* for that thou hast vouchsafed to deliver this thy servant from the great pain and peril of childbirth.”

SECTION II.

THE COMMINATION SERVICE.

This service bore the following title in the book of 1549—“ The first day of Lent, commonly called Ash Wednesday.”

The title was recomposed in 1552, as follows :—“ A Commination against sinners with certain prayers to be used *divers times* in the year.”

This title was again recomposed in 1661 in its present form :—“ A Commination, or denouncing of God’s anger and judgments against sinners, with certain prayers to be used on the first day of Lent, and at other times as the ordinary shall appoint.”

Thus (1) the book of 1549 limited the service to Ash Wednesday ; (2) the book of 1552 substituted “ *divers*

times" for Ash Wednesday; and (3) the book of 1662, as it is, specifies "the first day of Lent" and other times appointed by the ordinary.

The address was composed by our Reformers in 1549.

The opening rubric recognizes "*the Reading Pew*," which had been introduced by the Bishops for convenience. This recognition was added in 1661.

SECTION III.

THE FORMS OF PRAYER TO BE USED AT SEA.

The above forms were prepared for the revision of 1662.

1. It is observable that a *general confession* is prescribed, with the *precatory* form of absolution from the Communion Service in cases of "imminent danger."

Nothing is said of private confession and absolution on any occasion, which proves that the compilers of the service did not regard the Tribunal of Penance as the Divine ordinance for the remission of sin.

2. The words appointed for the committal of the dead to the sea, "looking for the resurrection of the body (when the sea shall give up her dead) and the life of the world to come," answer to, and may be regarded as expository of, the corresponding words in the service for the burial of the dead, "in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life."

CHAPTER XXI.

SECTION I.

THE ORDINAL.

THE Ordinal was prepared by a Commission, of which Archbishop Cranmer was the President. It was published in 1550, and incorporated with the Prayer Book in 1552. The preface, with a great portion of the Ordinal, was written by the Reformers.

The Ordination of Deacons.—The opening of the service was recomposed in 1549 from the old form. According to the mediæval Pontifical, Doorkeepers, Readers, Exorcists, Acolytes, and Sub-deacons were admitted to orders. These five were rejected by our Reformers.

After the commendation of the candidates to the prayers of the people, the Litany follows with the special supplication—for “those who are to be admitted to the order of Deacons or Priests.”

At the end of the prayer, “We humbly beseech thee,” “the Service for the Communion” follows, with a suitable epistle, 1 Tim. iii. 8, or Acts vi. 2. At this point, according to the Ordinal of 1550, the Oath of Supremacy was administered, recognizing “the King’s Majesty to be the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England.” The oath was modified in 1559: it was retained in 1662 as follows:—

“*The Oath of the King’s Sovereignty.*”

“I, A. B., do utterly testify and declare in my conscience, That the King’s Highness is the only supreme Governour of this Realm, and of all other his Highnesse’s dominions, and countries, as well in all Spiritual or Ecclesiastical things or causes, as Temporal: And that no foreign Prince, Person, Prelate, State, or Potentate hath or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this Realm. And, therefore, I do utterly renounce and forsake all foreign jurisdictions, powers, superiorities, and authorities, and do promise that from henceforth I shall bear faith and true allegiance to the King’s Highness, his heirs and lawful successors, and to my power shall assist and defend all jurisdictions, privileges, pre-eminentes, and authorities granted or belonging to the King’s Highness, his heirs and successors, or united and annexed to the Imperial Crown of this Realm. So help me God, and the contents of this book.”

This oath was modified in 1689 as follows:—

“I, A. B., do swear, that I do from my heart, abhor, detest, and abjure, as impious and heretical, that damnable doctrine and position, That Princes excommunicated or deprived by the Pope, or any authority of the See of Rome, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or any other whatsoever. And I do declare, that no foreign Prince, Person, Prelate, State, or Potentate, hath, or ought to have, any Jurisdiction, Power, Superiority, Pre-eminence or Authority, Ecclesiastical or Spiritual, within this Realm. So help me God.”

In 1858 it was modified again:—

“I, A. B., do swear, That I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Victoria, and will defend Her to the utmost of my Power against all Conspiracies and Attempts whatever which shall be made against Her Person, Crown, or Dignity ; and I will do my utmost Endeavour to disclose and make known to Her Majesty, Her Heirs and Successors, all Treasons and traitorous Conspiracies which may be formed against Her or them ; and I do faithfully promise to maintain, support, and defend, to the utmost of my Power, the Succession of the Crown, which Succession, by an Act intituled ‘An Act for the further Limitation of the Crown, and better securing the Rights and Liberties of the Subject,’ is and stands limited to the Princess Sophia, Electress of Hanover, and the Heirs of Her body being Protestants, hereby utterly renouncing and abjuring any Obedience or Allegiance unto any other Person claiming or pretending a Right to the Crown of this Realm ; and I do declare that no Foreign Prince, Person, Prelate, State, or Potentate hath, or ought to have, any Jurisdiction, Power, Supremacy, Pre-eminence, or Authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this Realm. And I make this Declaration upon the true Faith of a Christian. So help me God.”

The oath of allegiance and supremacy was modified again in 1865 as follows:—

“I, A. B., do swear, That I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Victoria, her heirs and successors according to law. So help me God.”

It was enacted in 1865 that *the oath should be administered before the service.*

The questions and answers were composed by our Reformers in 1550. Palmer remarks that they are “in some degree” peculiar to our service.

The formula, “Take thou authority,” was composed by our Reformers. The collect succeeding Communion was composed in 1550.

The Reformers rejected the invocation of saints, the signing with the cross, and the stole which was placed on the left shoulder.

The Ordering of Priests.—The address, “Good People;” the collect, “Almighty God;” the address to the candidates, “Ye have heard, brethren;” and the questions and answers following, were composed in 1550.

The *Veni Creator Spiritus* has descended from the primitive ages.

The Reformers rejected the mediæval formula:—
 “Receive thou power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate Masses for the living and the dead,” which was accompanied with the delivery of the sacramental vessels.

The formula, “Receive,” &c., is not the same as that in the Roman service, as it appears from the following parallel:—

The English Form.

“Receive the Holy Ghost, for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God and of his holy sacraments. In the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.”

The Romish Form.

“Receive thou the Holy Ghost, whosoever sins thou shalt remit, they are remitted unto them, and whose sins thou shalt retain, they are retained.”
 —*Translation.*

The words,

“For the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands,”
 were added in 1662.

The words “And be thou a faithful dispenser,” &c., composed in 1550, intimates the way in which the priest is a minister of the remission of sins—namely, by the faithful dispensing of the Word of God, and of His holy sacraments. The formula is precatory, closing with the Amen, which being in the same type as the form itself, is to be repeated by the bishop as well as others.

The formula which follows, and which is altogether reformatory, is authoritative. “Take thou authority to preach the Word of God, and to minister the holy sacraments in the congregation where thou shalt be lawfully appointed thereunto.” This is not accompanied by the Amen.

The prayer, “Most Merciful Father,” was composed in 1550.

The Consecration of Bishops.—The collect was inserted in 1661.

The address of the bishops to the archbishops is different from the Roman formula:—

The English.

“Most Reverend Father in God, we present unto you this godly and well learned man, to be ordained and consecrated Bishop.”

The Romish.

“Most Reverend Father, our *holy mother the Catholic Church*, demands that you elevate this present Presbyter to the burden of the Episcopate.”

The Ordinal of 1550 retained, as follows, the pastoral staff, with the use of surplice or albe, and cope or vestment:—

“(1.) After the Gospel and Credo ended, first the elected bishop, having upon him a surplice and a cope, shall be presented by two bishops (being also in surplices and copes, and *having their pastoral staves in their hands*) unto the Archbishop of the Province, or to some other bishop appointed by his commission: the bishops that present, saying.”—*Rubric in consecration service.*

“(2.) *Then shall the Archbishop put into his hands the pastoral staff*, saying,” &c.—*Ut supra.*

“(3.) And whosoever the bishop shall celebrate the holy communion in the church, or execute any other public ministration, he shall have upon him, besides his rochette, a surplice or albe, and a cope or vestment, and *also his pastoral staff in his hand*, or else borne or holden by his chaplain.”—*Notes at the end of the notice “of Ceremonies,” before Ordinal.*

All reference to cope and staff was removed in 1552. The rubric as settled in 1662, now is:—

“After the Gospel, and the Nicene Creed, and the Sermon are ended, the Elected Bishop (vested with his Rochet) shall be presented by two bishops unto the Archbishop of that province (or to some other bishop appointed by lawful commission), the Archbishop sitting in his chair near the holy table, and the bishops that present him saying.”

The pastoral staff with cope and vestment were thus set aside.

SECTION II.

THE MINISTRY.

Origin of the Episcopate.—The Bishop of Durham has given to the public a very able dissertation on the Ministry. See “*St. Paul’s Epistle to the Philippians*,” by T. B. Lightfoot, D.D. London, 1879.

As to Episcopacy, the Bishop draws conclusions from historic facts, as follows:—

“They indicate that the solution suggested by the history of the word ‘Bishop,’ and its transference from the lower to the higher office, is the true solution, and that the Episcopate was *created out of the Presbytery*. They show that the creation was not so much an isolated act as a *progressive development*, not advancing everywhere at a uniform rate, but exhibiting at one and the same time different stages of growth in different Churches.”—P. 227, *as above*.

The Preface to the Ordinal states, with good reason, that “from the Apostles’ time there have been these orders of Ministers in Christ’s Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons,” but whether the office of bishop was, at first, a *distinct* order from that of presbyter is a question which has been discussed even by the theologians of the Church of Rome. Alphonsus Liguori refers to the subject as follows:—

“Thence it is inquired, Whether the Episcopacy be a distinct order from the Presbytery? *St. Thomas, Bonaventure AND OTHERS DENY THAT IT IS*; who say that it is *an extension of the Presbyterian order*. But more commonly Bellarmine, Tournelly, Habert, Valentia, and Aversa, *AFFIRM THAT IT IS*.”—P. 223, t. 7, n. 738, lib. 6. Mech., 1845.

Jerome, ages before, held the following opinion. He says:—

“Before *factions* were introduced into religion by the instigation of the Devil, and before it was said among the people, I am of Paul, I of Apollos, I of Cephas, the Churches were governed by the Common Council of Presbyters; but after each one began to consider those whom he baptized to belong to himself, and not to Christ, it was decided throughout the world that one elected among the elders should be placed over the rest, so that the care of the Church should devolve on him, and the seeds of schism be removed.”—*Comment. on Epistles to Tim.*, chap. i.

Archbishop Cranmer took the same view. He says that bishops and priests were “both one office in the beginning of Christ’s religion.”—*Remains*, p. 117, vol. ii. P.S.

Practice of the Reformers.—While the Reformers held that the three orders are derived from Apostolic times, they did not deny the validity of non-Episcopal ordination. On the contrary, they maintained fraternal intercourse with Presbyterian Churches. Cranmer kept

up most friendly communications with Calvin and other Reformed Divines (see p. 28), and placed Martyr and Bucer respectively in the chairs of Divinity in Oxford and Cambridge. The same fraternal intercourse was maintained in the reign of Elizabeth, when Martyr was invited to return to England. The Calendar of 1561, prepared by Parker, Grindal and others, on the authority of a Royal prescript, supplies in foot-notes a chronological table which contains the following remarkable passage, under the head of August 27: "Religion as on this day, was reformed, according to God's express truth, in the most renowned city of Geneva."—*Liturgical Elizabethan Services*, p. 451. P.S.

The "Decades" of Bullinger, Pastor of Zurich, were approved by the bishops in Convocation, in 1586, as a standard work, which the clergy were required to read.

Whitgift, though the champion of Episcopacy against Cartwright, did not deny the validity of Presbyterian orders. He says:—

"So much we must esteem the word of God and his sacraments, that wheresoever we find them to be, there we may certainly know the Church of God to be, although, in the common life of men, many faults and errors be found. The same is the opinion of other godly and learned writers, and the judgment of the Reformed Churches, as appeareth by their confessions: so that notwithstanding government, or some kind of government, may be a part of the Church, touching the outward form and perfection of it, yet is it not such a part of the essence and being, but that it may be the Church of Christ, without this or that kind of government, and therefore the kind of government of the Church is *not necessary* unto salvation."—*Works*, p. 184, vol. i. P.S.

Clergymen holding Presbyterian orders were admitted to Livings without re-ordination. This fact is thus attested by Bishop Cosin:—

"Therefore if at any time, a minister so ordained in these French Churches, came to incorporate himself in ours, and to receive a public charge or cure of souls among us, in the Church of England (as I have known some of them to have so done of late, and can instance in many others before my time), our bishops did not re-ordain him before they admitted him to his charge, as they must have done, if his former ordination here in France had been void. Nor do our laws require more of him, than to declare his public consent to the religion received amongst us, and to subscribe the articles established."—*Letter to Mr. Cordel*, in Basire's account

of Bishop Cosin, annexed to his Funeral Sermon ; and also in Bishop Fleetwood's " Judgment of the Church of England, in the case of Lay Baptism."—P. 52, 2nd Ed. London, 1712.

The Church of Scotland.—The 55th Canon expressly refers to the Church of Scotland as a part of Christ's holy Catholic Church :—

" Before all Sermons, Lectures, and Homilies, the Preachers and Ministers shall move the people to join with them in prayer, in this form, *or to this effect*, as briefly as conveniently they may : Ye shall pray for Christ's holy Catholic Church, that is, for the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the whole world, and especially for the Churches of England, *Scotland*, and *Ireland*."—55th Canon.

The Church of Scotland in 1604, the date of this Canon, was not governed by bishops. The Presbyterian system had been set up in 1560, and the Episcopate was not restored till 1610. In the interval, certain persons were allowed, for political purposes, to bear the title of bishop ; but they were not duly consecrated, nor were they allowed to exercise the office. Lawson, in his " History of the Scottish Episcopal Church," quotes from Spottiswood's History, and says :—

" The objection to it which must occur to the sound Churchman is, that it was altogether a vain and futile system—that it was *no Episcopacy at all*, or so only in name—that the 'consecration' of Douglas and others by unauthorized men, one of whom was a layman, was disgraceful, outrageous, and most sinful—and that the whole was a political arrangement to serve particular purposes, and introduce a set of men into the Parliaments to represent the defunct and absent prelates of the fallen hierarchy, assuming their ecclesiastical titles, and pretending to be invested with the functions which it was impossible to obtain without consecration from bishops regularly and canonically consecrated. . . . Even the people ridiculed the persons 'inaugurated by such men as the Lay Bishop of Caithness, Winram, and Lindsay. They were long known by the very appropriate and significant *soubriquet* of *Tulchan Bishops*, derived from a practice then prevalent of stuffing a calf's skin with straw, and placing it before a cow, to induce the animal to give milk, which figure was called a *tulchan*—a term derived from a word signifying a model or a close resemblance. The tulchan hierarchy was a *complete deception*, and was merely one of *titles* connected with personal arrangements and political expediency, to say nothing of its gross perversion of the real Episcopate, and its schismatical profanity.'"

Supplement.—The word Priest. Nicholls remarks :—
" Our English word *Priest* comes immediately from the

French word *Prestre* or *Prêtre*, which is but a contraction of Presbyter, or Πρεσβύτερος (Presbnteros), and in its proper signification does denote no more than Elder. But there seems to be an abuse of the word crept into our language, and that of considerable standing; viz., to use the word only for sacrificer. For according to our common way of speaking, whenever the word Priest is named, people have presently a notion of sacrifice which was never intended by the first imposition of the word." (Quoted in "Marshall's Notes on Durel's Latin Prayer Book," p. 47. Oxford, 1882.) The Church of England in her homilies says:—"Herein thou needest no other man's help, no other sacrifice or oblation; *no sacrificing Priest*; no Mass; no means established by man's invention."—*Third part of the Sermon concerning the Sacrament.*

The Church of England has Priests or Presbyters, but "no sacrificing Priest."

It is admitted that the word *ἱερεύς* (Hiereus), the Greek for sacrificing Priest, is not applied in the New Testament to Ministers of the Gospel. Sadler remarks, that "some persons may stumble at this because *the actual name of Priest is never applied to a Christian Minister*," and quotes from Carter's "Doctrine of the Priesthood," p. 122, to endeavour to account for the fact. Carter says, "the term 'Sabbath' like the term 'Priest' is employed nowhere in the New Testament in reference to Christianity." (Sadler's "Church Doctrine," p. 227.) He admits the fact that the word Priest, or rather the word *ἱερεύς* (Hiereus) is not employed in Scripture to denote the Christian Minister, but the parallel which he draws is not just. The Sabbath was observed by the primitive Christians as well as the first day of the week, and therefore the word Sabbath was not applied to the first day of the week. The Jewish sacrifices and Priesthood, as typical of Christ and His Priesthood, were no longer recognized by Christians, as Christ is our Great High Priest; but, if it were true that His Ministers are sacri-

ficing Priests, it would not have been confusing, as Sadleir intimates, but only proper to state the fact. No such statement however exists, and the word which denotes a sacrificing Priest is nowhere applied in the New Testament to Ministers of the Gospel—*a fact which Sadleir and Carter admit.*

The Church of England in her Articles employs the word *Presbyter*, not *Sacerdos*, to denote her Priests. The title of the 32nd Article, “Of the Marriage of Priests” (de conjugio Sacerdotum), forms no exception because the word *Sacerdotum* applies in this instance to *Deacons* as well as Bishops and Priests, being used in its *wide* sense as descriptive of persons in holy orders: *Sacerdos* is derived from *Sacer*, *Sacred*.

The Latin Prayer Book, by Durel, A.D. 1670, published with high authority, employs the word *Presbyter* as the translation of *Priest*. On this subject see “The Latin Prayer Book of Charles II,” as before.

The Reformers rejected the mediæval formula, addressed to Priests in ordination, “Receive (accipe) thou *power to offer sacrifice to God*, and to celebrate masses for the living and the dead.”

Let us give special attention to the warning of our Church:—

“We must then take heed, lest, of the memory, it be made a *Sacrifice*.”—*Homily on the Sacrament*, 1st part.

CHAPTER XXII.

THE STATE SERVICES.

THE service for the fifth of November of thanksgiving for “the happy deliverance” from the Gunpowder plot; the service, with fasting, for the 30th of January, the anniversary of “the martyrdom” of King Charles; and the service for the 29th of May, of thanksgiving for “the restitution of the King and Royal family,”

were repealed by the Queen, in pursuance of an Address from Parliament, January 17, 1859.

“A Form of Prayer with Thanksgiving to Almighty God,” to be used on the 20th day of June, “being the day on which Her Majesty began her happy reign,” is obligatory, and most appropriate. The prayer in the thanksgiving has indeed been answered: “let her always possess *the hearts of her people*, that they may never be wanting in honour to her person, and dutiful submission to her authority; let her reign be *long and prosperous*.” Our Gracious Majesty has now reigned forty-seven years, and the earnest prayer of her people is that her days may still be prolonged. Is there a heart that will not join in the petition of the thanksgiving—“crown her with immortality in the life to come”? The prayer of the Psalmist is most justly applied to her in the opening canticle: “Let her dwell before thee for ever: O prepare thy loving mercy and faithfulness that they may preserve her.”—*Ps. lxi. 7.*

The suffrages, or petitions, are very appropriate, from which we quote as follows:—

Priest. O Lord, save the Queen.

Answer. Who putteth her trust in Thee.

SOME QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

CHAPTER I.

THE PRIMITIVE CHURCHES IN BRITAIN.

Q. What evidence exists as to the early introduction of Christianity into Britain?

A. Tertullian in the 2nd century, and Eusebius and Theodoret in the 4th and 5th centuries, refer to the Britons as subject to Christ. There are other witnesses to the same fact.

Q. Was the British Church recognized as a Church in the early ages?

A. Yes; its representatives attended the Councils of Sardica, A.D. 347, and of Ariminum, A.D. 359.

Q. To whom in Britain was Augustine, the Benedictine Monk of St. Andrew's, Rome, sent as a missionary?

A. To the Saxons, A.D. 596, who were Pagans.

Q. How does the independence of the British Church appear in connection with this event?

A. Augustine sought the co-operation of the British, but they refused to assist him, because he required them to adopt the Roman customs.

Q. Upon what authority do you make this statement?

A. Upon that of Bede, who lived in the 8th century, and who was in communion with the Church founded by Augustine.

Q. Is the evangelization of the Saxons due altogether to Augustine, the Roman missionary?

A. No; his mission at one time had almost failed. The Saxons were mainly evangelized under God by Aidan, Finan, and Colman, and their associates, all of whom adhered to their own customs, and steadily refused to unite with the Church founded by Augustine.

Q. When did the Saxon Church, thus established, enter into the Augustinian communion?

A. In the year 664. King Oswy, under the influence of his wife and son, convened a meeting of the

two parties in Whitby, at which the subject was discussed by Colman, on the one hand, and Wilfrid, the Roman advocate, on the other. The king gave his decision in favour of the latter, and Colman and his clergy rather than submit withdrew to Ireland.

Q. Did the British at this time follow the example of the Saxons?

A. No; they still maintained their independence as a Church. Bede refers to them as independent in the 8th century.

Q. What conclusion follows from the above facts?

A. That the Church of Rome cannot claim to be the original Church of Britain. The Church of England is the true descendant of the old Church of England.

CHAPTER II.

ROYAL SUPREMACY.

Q. Does Holy Scripture give authority for the Royal Supremacy?

A. Yes; as in the case of David, and others, who exercised it.

Q. Was such a supremacy in existence in the primitive Church?

A. Yes; Constantine, the first Christian Emperor, convened, and largely influenced, the Council of Nice, A.D. 325. Further, he heard an appeal from the decision of the Council of Arles, and investigated the grounds of division in the Donatist Controversy.

Q. Is such a supremacy now exercised in the Eastern Church?

A. Yes; the Russian branch is governed by the Holy Synod, which is under the control of the Emperor.

Q. Was such a supremacy in existence in the Anglo-Saxon Church?

A. Yes; kings often appointed bishops, and, though in communion with Rome, disregarded the authority of the Pope when it came into conflict with their own rights.

Q. By what means were causes ecclesiastical settled in the Anglo-Saxon Church?

A. By the authority of Courts, in which king and bishop often sat side by side.

Q. When were the jurisdictions separated?

A. In the reign of William the Conqueror, when it was arranged that bishops should hold Courts of their own.

Q. Did the king still assert his supremacy?

A. Yes. William the Conqueror did not allow a Papal bull to be published, nor a censure to be inflicted without his authority.

Q. When was the Royal Supremacy completely vindicated?

A. By the Acts 24th and 25th of Henry VIII.

Q. What was "the High Court of Commission?"

A. It was a judicial, and administrative, mixed body, by which the Crown directly exercised its supremacy.

Q. Upon what authority did it rest?

A. Act of Parliament, 1 Elizabeth, which restored to the Crown the rights which had been forfeited in the reign of Queen Mary.

Q. When, and by whom, was it abolished?

A. In the reign of Charles I, and by the Long, or Puritan, Parliament.

Q. What was the Court of Delegates?

A. It was the Court Commissioned, according to the 25th of Henry VIII, by the Crown, to hear cases of appeal. The Commission was appointed for each case.

Q. What is the history of the Court of Delegates?

A. It was abolished in the reign of Mary, but restored in that of Elizabeth. It continued till 1833, when its authority, as the adviser of the Crown, was transferred to the Privy Council.

Q. What change was effected in 1840?

A. By the 3rd and 4th Victoria, Archbishops and Bishops, being Privy Councillors, were placed on the Committee for hearing appeals.

Q. What change was effected in 1876?

A. It was provided that three bishops, one of whom must be an archbishop, should sit in the Court as Assessors.

Q. Is the principle of supremacy the same throughout?

A. Yes. The Crown is the supreme judge: the Court is the adviser of the Crown.

Q. Do the clergy assent to this in principle?

A. Yes. They accept the Royal Supremacy and receive the discipline of the Church as "this Church and Realm hath received the same."—*Ordination Vow.*

CHAPTER III.

PAPAL CORRUPTIONS.

Q. What position did the Bishop of Rome occupy in the Primitive Church?

A. As the Bishop of the capital of the Roman empire, he exercised much influence, but did not possess authority over other bishops.

Q. What circumstances led to the augmentation of his power?

A. When the seat of government was removed from Rome to Constantinople, the Romans and others regarded the Bishop with undue deference.

Q. How does it appear that even as yet the Bishop of Rome was not regarded as supreme?

A. The General Council of Chalcedon decreed that equal privileges belonged to the Bishop of New Rome (Constantinople) to those of the ancient city.

Q. Who conferred the title of Universal Bishop upon the Bishop of Rome?

A. The Emperor Phocas, A.D. 606. Cardinal Baronius states that the Emperor took this step from enmity to the Bishop of Constantinople.

Q. What documents were forged for the purpose of increasing the power of the Popes?

A. "The donation of Constantine," so called, and the forged epistles, which were invented in the 9th century.

Q. Show that creature worship grew up in the Church?

A. The invocation of saints, which was unknown in apostolic times and the early ages, culminated in the worship of the Virgin, and of other saints. Images, which were abhorrent to the Primitive Church, were gradually introduced, and their use in religious services led to their adoration.

Q. When was the doctrine of corporal presence first publicly advocated?

A. In the 9th century, by Pascharius Radbert.

Q. When was the doctrine of transubstantiation formally defined?

A. In the Council of Florence, A.D. 1215.

Q. When was the doctrine of the Mass defined?

A. By the Council of Trent, twenty-second session, A.D. 1562, when it was decreed that the Mass is a

propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead.

Q. Did the Council of Trent venture to assert that the Holy Communion, as administered in the night before Jesus died, was a propitiatory sacrifice?

A. No; it simply asserted that Christ offered Himself as a sacrifice in that night, but did not add that the sacrifice was propitiatory. Several of the bishops properly contended that the propitiation was not made until the crucifixion.

Q. What remark do you make on this?

A. The Holy Communion is now what it was on the night of institution. It was not a propitiatory sacrifice on that night, and it is not a propitiatory sacrifice now.

Q. When was the doctrine of Purgatory defined?

A. In the Council of Florence, A.D. 1215. This doctrine has led to indulgences, and mass-traffic, for the release of souls from Purgatory.

Q. By whom and when were the twelve new articles added to the Nicene Creed?

A. By Pope Pius IV, in 1564.

Q. Have any new articles of faith been set up since then?

A. Yes; the doctrine of the immaculate conception, A.D. 1854, and that of the Pope's infallibility, A.D. 1870.

CHAPTER IV.

MEDIÆVAL SERVICE BOOKS.

Q. What was the character of the Missals in use before the Reformation?

A. As the mass books, they were unscriptural and superstitious in character. They retained, however, from earlier times, many expressions inconsistent with mediæval doctrine.

Q. What was the Breviary?

A. The book of daily service containing, with psalms and canticles, and lessons, much that was superstitious and legendary.

Q. What were the Manual and Pontifical?

A. The Manual was the book of occasional offices, such as those for baptism and the visitation of the sick; and the Pontifical was designed for the use of bishops in confirmation and consecration.

Q. What other books were in use?

A. "The Hours of the Blessed Virgin," of the Cross, and the Holy Spirit, used by monks, and laity, in various forms.

CHAPTER V.

REVISION OF 1549.

Q. What leading measures were taken in the reign of Henry VIII to promote Reformation?

A. The abolition of the Papal Supremacy, the translation and circulation of Holy Scripture, and the suppression of monasteries.

Q. What leading measures were taken in 1547 after the accession of Edward VI?

A. Injunctions were published for the removal of images which had been abused: the first book of Homilies was published; and the six articles of 1536 were repealed.

Q. What leading measures were taken in 1548?

A. An order of Council was issued for the total removal of images, and a commission was appointed to revise the public services; an order of communion in both kinds was authorized.

Q. When did the first reformed Prayer Book come into use?

A. Whit Sunday, June, 1549.

Q. How were the public services affected thereby?

A. The services were conducted in the English tongue; the elevation of the consecrated elements was forbidden, and many superstitious ceremonies were swept away, but it was soon felt that the book needed revision.

Q. When was its revision carried into effect?

A. In 1552, when the words altar and mass were expunged, and prayers for the dead, extreme unction, and numerous superstitious ceremonies were rejected.

CHAPTER VI.

REVISION OF 1552.

Q. What steps were taken for the removal of altars before the publication of the book of 1552?

A. Ridley, Bishop of London, issued injunctions directing the clergy "to set up the Lord's board after the form of an honest table."

Q. Were other bishops required to take similar measures?

A. Yes, but Day, Bishop of Chichester, refused to comply, and was summoned before the Council.

Q. What defence did he make?

A. He referred to Hebrews xiii. 10, but the Archbishop and Ridley, Bishop of London, declared that Christ is our Altar.

Q. What assistance did Cranmer seek in the revision of the book of 1549?

A. He invited Peter Martyr, and Martin Bucer, to England, and placed them in the Chairs of Divinity in Oxford and Cambridge, and requested them to give their opinion upon the whole question of revision, which they did. In some respects their advice was taken.

Q. When did the revised book come into use?

A. On the feast of All Saints', November 1, 1552.

Q. What was the general character of the revision?

A. It was decidedly Protestant in its character, in its omissions, additions, and changes. The Prayer Book is still essentially the same.

CHAPTER VIII.

REVISIONS OF 1559 AND 1604.

Q. What steps were taken for the restoration of the Prayer Book on the accession of Elizabeth?

A. The Queen ascended the throne, 17th November, 1558, and, in the next month, a Committee was appointed to consult as to the public services. They selected the book of 1552, in preference to that of 1549, and the Act of Uniformity was passed April 28, 1559.

Q. But there were some alterations effected in the book thus adopted.

A. Yes; the forms of address in the delivery of the sacrament, provided by the books of 1549 and 1552, were combined; Special Lessons were appointed for Sunday; the deprecation in the Litany, "from the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome, and all his detestable enormities, Good Lord deliver us," was omitted, and the ornaments of the church and minister were regulated not by rubric, but by a special clause in the Act of Uniformity, authorizing those of 1549, but empowering

the Crown to take "other order" in reference thereto. There were other alterations of no great importance.

Q. What became of the declaration which had been added to the book of 1552, by order of Council?

A. It was omitted as unnecessary. It was however restored in 1662.

Q. What changes were effected in 1604 as the result of the Hampton Court Conference?

A. The words "or remission of sins," in the title of the absolution; the questions relating to the Sacraments in the Catechism; the words "lawful minister" in the rubric preceding the service for private baptism, and occasional prayers and thanksgivings were added. The most important result of the Hampton Court Conference was the new translation of the Bible, effected in 1611.

CHAPTER VIII.

REVISION OF 1662.

Q. Did the Savoy Conference succeed in its attempt to revise the Prayer Book?

A. No; the Commissioners consisting in equal numbers of Episcopal and Puritan Divines could not agree.

Q. What was the result of the failure?

A. Convocation undertook the office of revision.

Q. Were any of the suggestions, refused in the Savoy Conference, adopted?

A. Yes, in many instances; the most notable of which was the restoration of the declaration on kneeling in the Lord's Supper.

Q. Were any efforts made to revise in a reactionary sense?

A. Yes; it was proposed to place the table as a *fixture* in the chancel; that the priest should "offer up" the elements in placing them on the table; that wafer bread should be allowed, and the words "militant here on earth" struck out of the title of the prayer for "the whole state of Christ's Church militant here on earth," but the proposal was rejected.

Q. Is the Prayer Book, as settled in 1662, essentially the same as that of 1604?

A. Yes; and so it is implied in the Preface.—See 4th paragraph of Preface.

CHAPTER IX.

ACTS OF UNIFORMITY, PREFACE, AND NOTICES.

Q. What are the Sealed Books ?

A. They are copies of the original Prayer Book, and bear the Great Seal required by the Act of 1662. These books are in the custody of cathedral capitular bodies and courts of law. They are the standard to which all Prayer Books should conform.

Q. What Acts of Uniformity are attached to the Sealed Books ?

A. The Acts of 1559 and 1662.

Q. Does the Preface to the Prayer Book, authorized in 1662, imply that the revision of 1662 effected any change in principle in either doctrine or ritual ?

A. No ; as it is evident from the 4th paragraph.

Q. When was the notice "concerning the service of the Church" composed ?

A. In 1549. Cranmer is supposed to have been its author.

Q. To what does it chiefly relate ?

A. The public reading of Holy Scripture.

Q. When was the notice "of Ceremonies" composed ?

A. In 1549. It sets forth the truth that Christ's Gospel "is a religion to serve God, not in bondage of the figure or shadow, but in the freedom of the spirit," a principle which was further carried into effect in the revision of 1552.

CHAPTER X.

THE CALENDAR AND TABLE OF LESSONS.

Q. When was the Calendar prepared ?

A. For the Prayer Book of 1549 ; but, since then, it has undergone considerable alteration.

Q. What controversy existed in the early Church as to the time of keeping Easter ?

A. The question was debated whether it should be observed on the day of the Passover, or the Sunday after.

Q. What was the rule established by the Council of Nice ?

A. That Easter should be observed on Sunday after, not on the Paschal day.

Q. When were the Tables to find Easter set aside, and the Calendar reformed ?

A. By an Act entitled, "An Act for regulating the commencement of the year, and for regulating the Calendar now in use," passed in the reign of George II.

Q. What was the object of the Reformers in the construction of the Table of Lessons?

A. To provide for the *profitable* and *continuous* reading of Holy Scripture.

Q. How was the mediæval practice unprofitable and interrupted?

A. The lessons were in Latin, and detached in very short portions, interrupted by the introduction of legends, anthems, and responds.

CHAPTER XI.

FESTIVALS AND FASTS.

Q. What Saints are commemorated by the Church of England?

A. Only those of Apostles, and others, mentioned in Holy Scripture.

Q. How has she marked the observance?

A. By the appointment of Epistles, and Gospels, and Collects, suited to the day.

Q. What other commemorations does she observe?

A. Those of great events, such as the Advent, or coming of Christ, Christmas, the Circumcision of Christ, Epiphany.

Q. What do you mean by Black Letter Days?

A. Days printed in the ordinary black ink, for which no special observance is appointed.

Q. Why are names retained in the Calendar, without the appointment of any special service as pertaining to them?

A. For public convenience. The ecclesiastical authorities in the year 1564 assigned this as the reason, and expressly stated that the names are retained as "notes and tokens of appointed seasons."

Q. Does the Church of England presume to state who are beatified?

A. No; she only commemorates the memory of scriptural saints, for God only knows the heart.—1 Kings viii. 39.

Q. Why has the Church provided a form of daily service?

A. In order that such service may be held when and where it is necessary, or practicable.

Q. What considerations show that the Church does not require daily service as a universal rule?

A. 1. The direction regarding daily service admits of a reasonable hindrance. 2. The service presupposes the presence of a congregation. 3. The direction requires notice to be given by the ringing of a bell. 4. Canons and injunctions require service on Wednesday and Friday.

CHAPTER XII.

ORNAMENTS OF THE CHURCH AND MINISTER.

Q. Was the question of vestments regulated by rubric in the book of 1559?

A. No; the second Prayer Book of King Edward VI (A.D. 1552) was attached to the Act of Uniformity of 1559, but a special clause in that Act nullified the rubric of the second Prayer Book of Edward VI.

Q. How did the clause nullify the rubric of the book of 1552?

A. It provided that such ornaments should be retained as were enjoined by the authority of Parliament in the 2nd of Edward VI—that is by the first book of King Edward VI, until the Queen, with the advice of the Metropolitan, or Commissioners, took “other order?”

Q. What vestments were enjoined by the second book of King Edward VI (A.D. 1552) to be worn by ministers?

A. Simply the surplice.

Q. What was the effect of the proviso of the Act of 1559?

A. It placed the appointment of vestments in the hands of the Crown.

Q. Did it legalize the vestments appointed by the first book?

A. Yes; but only until the Queen took “other order.”

Q. Did the Queen regulate the vestments of the clergy, and thus take “other order?”

A. Yes; by the Injunctions of 1559, and the Advertisements of 1565-6.

Q. What vestments were appointed by the advertisements?

A. The surplice in parish churches in ministrations, and the cope in cathedral and collegiate churches in the Lord's Supper.

Q. Were the vestments prescribed by the first book (1549) allowed in the reign of Elizabeth?

A. No. With the exception of the cope, which was allowed under certain conditions, they were destroyed everywhere; and in cases, not allowed, even the cope was destroyed.

Q. How long was the question of vestments regulated by this proviso of the Act of 1559.

A. Until the year 1662, when the rubric as it now is regarding ornaments was authorized.

Q. Was there not an ornaments' rubric in the Prayer Books of 1559 and 1604?

A. Yes, but it was a mere note of reference to the proviso of the Act of 1559; it was not covered by the Act.

Q. Was the rubric, or note of reference of 1559, adopted by authority in 1662?

A. It was altered, and adopted. The word "retained" was introduced ("such ornaments . . . shall be *retained*"), which implies that only the ornaments which had been in use are legal. The Church could not *retain* what she was not in possession of.

Q. If the novel vestments were legal, what would follow?

A. That the whole practice of the Church for three centuries has been contrary to law.

Q. In what sense is the word "ornaments" used in the rubric?

A. In that of *instrumenta*, or things employed in Divine Service, not merely for purposes of decoration.

Q. Is the cross recognized by the rubric as an *instrumentum*?

A. No; and therefore its use is excluded from Divine Service.

Q. Is the cross lawful, as an *architectural* decoration?

A. Yes, but it rests with the Ordinary to prevent its abuse.

Q. Is it lawful to place the cross, and lights in daylight, on the communion table?

A. No. Lights are only lawful when required to give light.

Q. Is it lawful to cover the holy table in communion time with linen embroidered with lace.

A. No. At non-communion times, the covering of the table is at the discretion of the Ordinary.

Q. Is a side table lawful ?

A. Yes, but not as an appendage to an altar.

CHAPTER XIII.

MORNING AND EVENING PRAYER.

Q. What important additions were prefixed to Morning and Evening Prayer in 1552 ?

A. The Sentences, Address, Confession, and Absolution.

Q. What important principle was involved in the public General Confession and Absolution ?

A. That private Confession and Absolution are not necessary.

Q. What do you mean by the word *versicles* ?

A. The short verses which follow the Lord's Prayer and in other places, repeated alternately by minister and people.

Q. What is the arrangement as to the Psalms ?

A. They are said, or sung, through every month.

Q. What is the arrangement as to the Lessons ?

A. They are read from the Old and New Testament in order, according to the table which was reconstructed in 1872.

Q. What are the Canticles ?

A. The hymns of praise, sung morning and evening, before and after the lessons.

Q. What is the Apostles' Creed ?

A. A short summary of the Christian faith, setting forth the doctrines which the Apostles taught, and is, therefore, called the Apostles' Creed.

Q. What is the Athanasian Creed ?

A. A more extensive summary of the Christian faith than the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, with special reference to the Holy Trinity.

Q. From what sources are the *versicles*, and *collects*, derived ?

A. The *versicles* are taken from Scripture; some of the *collects* were composed by the Reformers; others are derived from the Primitive Church. The prayers "for the Queen's Majesty," and "the Royal Family," were composed by the Reformers.

Q. When were the "Thanksgivings upon several occasions" composed ?

A. In 1549, 1552, and in 1661.

Q. When were the prayers for Parliament, and “all conditions of men,” composed?

A. The former in 1625, modified in 1661; the latter in 1661.

Q. When were the General and Special Thanksgivings composed?

A. The General Thanksgiving in 1661. The other thanksgivings, with the exception of “for restoring public peace at home” composed in 1661, were added in 1604.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE LITANY AND COLLECTS.

Q. When was the Litany translated into English?

A. In 1544, when also the invocations of saints were expunged, with the exception of three clauses, which were shortly after struck out.

Q. Is the Litany, as now existing, identical with any more ancient Litany?

A. No; it was compiled by Cranmer, who had before him the Litany, as reformed by the authority of Hermann, Archbishop of Cologne.

Q. Did the most ancient Litanies contain the invocation of Saints?

A. No. Such invocations are not found in Litanies existing before the 8th century.

Q. What was the origin of the Rogation Days?

A. Mamertus in the 5th century, on the occasion of public calamities, appointed Litanies to be said on the three days before Ascension, which are therefore called Rogation Days on account of the supplications, or rogations, offered thereon.

Q. Does the Church of England sanction processional Litanies?

A. No; they were abolished by the Injunctions of 1547 and 1559.

Q. Does she retain the Rogation Days?

A. Yes; and she has provided a Homily in reference thereto.

Q. Why did she retain the perambulation of parishes?

A. To mark the boundaries, but the above Injunctions require the Litany to be said, not in procession, but in the church.

CHAPTER XV. THE COMMUNION SERVICE.

Q. Is it true that this service is but a modified form of the Sarum Mass?

A. No; it is essentially different.

Q. Did the Reformers, who compiled the service, regard the Communion as essentially the same as the Sarum Mass?

A. No. Cranmer, on the restoration of the Mass in the reign of Mary, protested against it, and indignantly denied that he had said Mass. In the same document, he offered to defend publicly the Book of Common Prayer of 1552.

Q. Did the Reformers admit that the Communion Table is an Altar of Sacrifice?

A. No. They commanded altars to be taken down. They struck out the word "altar" from the Prayer Book.

Q. When were the Commandments introduced into the Communion Service?

A. In 1552. The use of the decalogue in the service is a distinguishing feature of the Church of England.

Q. By whom were the four exhortations composed?

A. By the Reformers.

Q. What are the alms and oblations?

A. The money offerings of the people. The Injunctions of 1547 direct "the oblations and alms" for the poor to be put in a chest.

Q. Has the Prayer of Consecration been derived from the Mass?

A. No, it was composed by our Reformers. The only point of identity consists in the quotation from Scripture of the words of institution.

Q. Why was the Post-Communion declaration added to the service, and what does it teach?

A. It was intended to remove the scruples of those who objected to kneel in the Lord's Supper. It explains that the kneeling is expressive of gratitude, and not an act of adoration "either to the consecrated elements," or to "*any* corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood." It teaches that Christ's natural body is in Heaven, and "*not here*."

Q. What was the *Agape*?

A. The feast at which the Holy Communion was administered in the Primitive Church.

Q. What evidence does this afford as to the Holy Communion?

A. It shows that, in the Primitive Church, the Communion was not regarded as a propitiatory sacrifice with altar, vestments, and sacrificing priest, none of which would have been consistent with the *Agape*. The Church of Rome, in accordance with her doctrine of the Mass, has substituted a *fast* for a *feast*.

Q. What considerations are inconsistent with the notion that Christ Himself, the living and glorified Saviour, is in the consecrated elements?

A. Considerations founded upon the occasion, the circumstances, and the words of institution, and the law regarding blood.

Q. What was the occasion?

A. The Paschal feast, which was commemorative in its character. Jesus spoke of "this passover," but the lamb to which He referred was not actually the passover—*i.e.*, the act of the Lord *passing over* the children of Israel—but its memorial. So the bread and wine are the memorials of Christ's body and blood.

Q. What were the circumstances?

A. There was no altar, and no priest at the Last Supper, and the Communion took place, not after a fast, but a feast.

Q. What were the words of institution?

A. "This is my body, which *is broken* for you, do this in remembrance of me. This cup *is* the *new Testament* in my blood, which *is shed* for you, do this as often as ye shall drink it in remembrance of me" (1 Cor. xi. 24, 25). But Christ's body was not broken, and His blood was not shed until the day after. It might as well be said that the cup is literally the New Testament as that the bread is literally the body of Christ.

Q. How does it appear, further, that the blood of Christ is not literally partaken of?

A. It is contrary to the law of God to drink blood, Acts xv. 28, 29.

Q. What is represented in the Lord's Supper?

A. The death of Christ, the bread representing His body, and the wine His blood, as separate, 1 Cor. xi. 26.

Q. What is meant by non-communicant attendance?

A. The hearing of the Communion Service without the reception of the Communion.

Q. Did the Reformers approve of non-communicant attendance?

A. No; they introduced into the Prayer Book of 1552 an exhortation containing a passage strongly condemnatory of it.

Q. What was the effect of this measure?

A. Non-communicant attendance died out in the Church of England.

Q. Why was this passage removed in 1662?

A. Because it was no longer needed.

Q. What does the Church say in the Homilies on this subject?

A. That we must be "guests not gazers."

Q. What does the Council of Trent teach as to the Mass?

A. That Christ *Himself* is offered therein as truly as on the cross, the only difference being in the *manner* of offering.

Q. Is this doctrine contrary to Scripture?

A. It is plainly opposed to the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews ix. 25-28, x. 1-18, and other portions.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE BAPTISMAL OFFICES, THE CATECHISM AND CONFIRMATION.

Q. By whom, and from what sources, are our Baptismal Offices derived?

A. By our Reformers, who took many hints from the office which was prepared by Bucer, at the request of Hermann, Prince Archbishop of Cologne, who had introduced the Reformation into his territories. While they composed several portions of our services, they rejected the superstitions of the mediæval service.

Q. When was the Service for the Baptism of such as are of Riper Years composed?

A. In 1661, on account of the neglect of baptism during the Commonwealth.

Q. When was the Catechism first published?

A. In 1549, when it appeared in the Reformed Prayer Book of that date.

Q. When were the questions and answers regarding the Sacraments added to the Catechism?

A. In 1604, at the suggestion of the Puritans.

Q. By whom and from what book were these questions and answers abridged ?

A. By Bishop Overall, who “penned them” in a short form from Nowell’s Catechism. The abridgment was submitted to the bishops, amongst whom was Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury.

Q. When were persons confirmed according to the mediæval rule ?

A. Immediately after baptism ; but this custom was rejected by our Reformers, who required that Confirmation should be administered to those who are “able to render an account of their faith.”

Q. What is meant by Confirmation ?

A. The ratification, or confirmation, by the baptized of the promises made for them in infancy, and also the admission of the candidate to the full privileges of membership, by the laying on of hands, with prayer.

Q. What is the meaning of the word regeneration, or new birth ?

A. It denotes a change of condition, either external, or moral.

Q. Prove that it sometimes means an external change.

A. Christ speaks of “children of the kingdom,” who shall be cast into outer darkness (Matt. viii. 12). The figure of childhood implies that of birth.

Q. Prove that it sometimes denotes moral change, or renovation.

A. St. John says, “He that loveth is born of God and knoweth God,” 1 John iv. 7.

Q. How does this distinction appear in the Old Testament ?

A. The Jews are called “*the children*” of the Lord (Deut. xiv. 1), “a holy people,” Deut. viii. 6.

Q. What is the meaning of the word holy ?

A. It means separated, or devoted, to sacred purposes.

Q. Show that it cannot always imply an internal change.

A. The word is applied to things which are incapable of moral change, such as censers (Numb. xvi. 37) and “holy places,” which were holy in the sense of dedication to sacred purposes.

Q. Show that the distinction between outward change and inward renovation was recognized in the Old Testament.

A. Moses refers to the circumcision of the flesh and that of the heart. He exhorts those who possessed the former to seek the latter, Deut. xxx. 6.

Q. Show that the New Testament recognizes this distinction.

A. St. Paul distinguishes between the outward and the inward Jew, and the circumcision in the flesh and in the heart, Rom. ii. 28, 29.

Q. Prove that even gifts of the Spirit might be possessed by some who had not experienced the inward renovation.

A. The Apostle, having referred to such gifts, says, "Though I have the gift of prophecy and understand all mysteries, and have not charity (love), I am as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal," 1 Cor. xiii. 1.

Q. Has the Church of England given any formal definition of regeneration in connection with baptism?

A. No; but she has rejected the notion that the Sacraments confer grace unconditionally, or, as it is taught by the Council of Trent, *ex opere operato*, by "the work wrought."

Q. How does it appear that she rejects this notion?

A. In the 25th Article, in which she says, "And in such only as worthily receive the same they have a wholesome effect or operation."

Q. Show that the Baptismal Service is founded upon the charitable hypothesis, or supposition, that the recipients of baptism will enter into the kingdom of heaven.

A. In the address, the following words occur, "Doubt ye not, therefore, but earnestly believe, that He will likewise favourably receive this present infant; that He will embrace him with the arms of His mercy, that He will give unto him the blessing of *eternal life*, and make him partaker of his *everlasting kingdom*."

Q. How do you understand the words, "Seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, that this child is regenerate?"

A. The child in every case undergoes a change of state, and is regenerate in that sense, being translated from the world into the kingdom of Christ, which consists of the visible Church; and moreover, in "this charitable service of ours," we hope and pray, upon the above hypothesis or supposition, that God will endow the child "with *heavenly virtues*," or change of heart.

Q. How is this view sustained by the Service for the Baptism of those who are of riper years?

A. The words after baptism are, "Seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, that these persons are regenerate," but even the Church of Rome admits that adults receiving baptism in a state of impenitence and unbelief do not receive the grace of renovation.

Q. What facts bear upon this subject?

A. 1. The question in all its aspects was discussed by the framers of the 25th Article, which was so constructed as, not only to avoid the definition of regeneration in the sense of moral renovation, but to condemn the doctrine of *opus operatum*.

2. The Baptismal Service is derived from the Cologne Service, prepared by Bucer, who did not hold that all the baptized undergo a moral change.

3. The Prayer Book of 1549, with its Baptismal Service, was submitted for criticism to Bucer and Peter Martyr, neither of whom objected to the above expressions, while they recommended the expurgation of several other points. Peter Martyr, in 1552, said of the revised baptismal office, "all things are removed from it which savour of superstition."

4. The old Puritans assailed the office of sponsors and the sign of the cross, but raised no objection as to the affirmation of regeneration, although they strongly held that baptism and moral renovation were not inseparable.

CHAPTERS XVII AND XVIII. THE MARRIAGE SERVICE AND THE VISITATION OF THE SICK.

Q. When, or from what source, is the *Marriage Service* derived?

A. The opening and closing addresses, the prayer, "O Eternal God," &c., and the form of pronouncing of the parties to be man and wife, were composed for the book of 1549. The crossings were omitted in 1552. Other portions which were free from error were retained from the old office.

Q. When was the compulsory reception of the Lord's Supper changed to the optional?

A. In 1662. The Puritans had objected to compulsory reception.

Q. What superstitious practices were abolished in the *Visitation of the Sick* in the revision of 1552?

A. The use of holy water, images, extreme unction, and crossings.

Q. What improvements were effected in 1662?

A. The second benediction, and the four prayers were added.

Q. In what case is the absolution provided in this service to be pronounced?

A. When the sick person's conscience is "troubled" with some "weighty matter," and when he "humbly and heartily" desires it.

Q. What is the rule in the Church of Rome?

A. Confession in *every* case is *essential*.

Q. Why is it regarded as essential by the Church of Rome?

A. Because the Priest is supposed to be the Vicegerant of God in the Confessional, and the absolution, in the *exact prescribed form*, is supposed to be the medium of Divine forgiveness to the contrite, or attrite.

Q. Does the Church of England take this view?

A. Confession, as contemplated by her, is the *exception*, and not the rule, and the absolution may be pronounced after "this *sort*," not this *form*.

Q. Is it necessary to pronounce the absolution even after "this sort?"

A. No; the 67th Canon leaves the use of the service to the option of the minister.

Q. In what form did the primitive absolutions run?

A. In the *precatory*, that of prayer.

Q. When was the indicative form introduced, and for what purpose?

A. In the 12th century, and for the remission of Church censures.

Q. Were Church censures imposed after the Reformation?

A. Yes, and they continued in use until the beginning of the 18th century.

Q. How does it appear that this absolution was retained for the remission of censures?

A. From the fact that the absolution is followed by a prayer for Divine forgiveness, which would be unsuitable if the absolution had already conveyed it.

Q. Are forms of absolution provided by other Reformed Churches?

A. Yes ; the forms in the Church of Scotland of excommunication and absolution are very forcible.

Q. State in brief the nature of the three absolutions provided by the Church of England.

A. First, the absolution in the opening of the Morning and Evening Services is *declaratory* ; second, the absolution in the Communion Service is *precatory* ; and third, that in the Visitation of the Sick is *ecclesiastical*, having reference to Church censures.

Q. How did the Apostles remit sins ?

A. By the preaching of the Word, of which Acts xiii. 38, 39 is an example, and by the remission of censures, of which 1 Cor. v. 3-5, compared with 2 Cor. ii. 6-10, is an example.

Q. Did not Christ say to His disciples, “ whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted ? ” John xx. 23.

A. He did, and the Apostles remitted as above. Daniel refers to those who “ *turn* many to righteousness ” (Dan. xii. 3). Paul says, “ If by any means I may *save* some of them ” (Rom. xi. 14). He says to Timothy, thou shalt “ *save* thyself, and *them* that hear thee ” (1 Tim. iv. 16) ; and so ministers remit sins by being the means of remission.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE BURIAL SERVICE.

Q. What characteristic distinguishes the Reformed Service for the Burial of the Dead from the Mediæval or Roman ?

A. The Reformed service is for the *living* ; the Mediæval or Roman service refers mainly to the *dead*.

Q. How does it appear that prayer for the dead has been deliberately rejected by the Church of England ?

A. The Prayer Book of 1549 retained some prayers for the dead, which were entirely removed in 1552.

Q. But do we not pray “ that we with all those who have departed in the true faith of thy holy name may have our perfect consummation and bliss both in body and soul ? ” (Com. Service).

A. Yes ; but the prayer in which these words occur is for “ Christ’s Church *Militant here in earth*,” which limits it to the living. It is a prayer that we may share the bliss of the righteous in resurrection glory, in the reunion of soul and body. The bliss of the departed

believer is perfect now in his soul ; it will be perfect both in body and soul at the resurrection.

Q. Does the Church of England teach that the soul of the believer enters into bliss at death ?

A. Yes ; (1) in the prayer and collect preceding the benediction in the Burial Service, (2) in "a prayer for a sick child," "a prayer for a sick person," and "a commendatory prayer" at the end of the service for the Visitation of the Sick, and (3) in the third part of the sermon (Homily) concerning prayer.

Q. Did the English Reformers reject prayer for the dead?

A. Yes ; with one consent.

CHAPTER XX.

THE CHURCHING OF WOMEN, COMMINATION SERVICE, AND FORMS OF PRAYER TO BE USED AT SEA.

Q. What was the title of the Churching Service in 1549 ?

A. "The Order for the Purification of Women."

Q. Why was it altered to its present form ?

A. To disassociate it from the Jewish Service of Purification.

Q. What was meant by the "Chrisom" prescribed by the book of 1549 ?

A. A white dress to put on the infant immediately after baptism. This was omitted in 1552.

Q. What title did the Commination Service bear in the book of 1552 ?

A. "The first day of Lent, commonly called Ash Wednesday."

Q. When was the title brought to its present form ?

A. In 1661, fully expressing its design as a warning against sin.

Q. When was the Form of Prayer to be used at Sea authorized ?

A. In 1662.

Q. What special points are noticeable in it ?

A. It provides the precatory absolution in cases of imminent danger ; and in the committal of the dead to the deep, it uses the words "looking for the resurrection of the body," which may be regarded as explanatory of the parallel words in the Service for the Burial of the Dead.

CHAPTER XXI.
T H E O R D I N A L.

Q. When was the Ordinal first authorized?

A. In 1550. It was incorporated into the Prayer Book of 1552.

Q. How is the English Ordinal distinguished from the Mediaeval or Roman?

A. By the omission of superstitious forms, and by its simplicity.

Q. How do you understand the words "Whosoever sins you remit," &c. John xx. 23?

A. They have the same meaning in the Ordinal as in Scripture. Ministers remit sins by the Word of God.

Q. The Church of England requires episcopal ordination for those who minister in her Communion?

A. She does, but this requirement does not involve the denial of the validity of orders in other Communions though not episcopal.

Q. How does this appear?

A. The 55th Canon of 1604 refers to "the Church of Scotland" as a part of "Christ's holy Catholic Church," though the Scottish Church at that date was under Presbyterian government.

CHAPTER XXII.
THE STATE SERVICES.

Q. Which of "the State services" is now in force?

A. That for the accession of our Gracious Sovereign Lady Queen Victoria; it is most appropriate.

INDEX.

ABSOLUTION, the, in Morning and Evening Prayer, 82 ; In the Communion office, 118 ; In the visitation of the sick, 184 ; Scripture as to, 187 ; Kirk of Scotland as to, 196 ; Homilies as to, 197.

Ab Ulmis, John, as to the change in Cranmer's Eucharistic views, 26.

Acts or Statutes of 1534 and '5 vindicated the Royal Supremacy, 10 ; Of 1st Elizabeth empowered the Crown to appoint Commissioners to regulate ecclesiastical questions, 11 ; Of William IV, transferred the appeal from the Court of Delegates to the Privy Council as the adviser of the Crown, 11 ; The 3rd and 4th of Victoria placed Bishops on the Courts, 11 ; This amended in 1876, when Bishops were appointed to act as assessors, 11 ; Vestments regulated by Act of Uniformity, 1559, 32 ; Acts of Uniformity of 1559 and 1662 are affixed to the sealed books, 37 ; Proviso, proposed but rejected, in the Act of Uniformity of 1662 for the relief of the Puritans, 37.

Adamnan's life of Columba, 3. **Advertisements**, the, published in 1565-6, referred to as the "other order" in the Hampton Court conference, 34 ; Enactments of, 72 ; First draft of contained points which caused delay, 73 ; Were published as "ordained by the Queen's Majesty's authority," 74 ; Convocation of 1571 refers to them, 75 ; Canons of 1604, on the point of vestments, enacts in terms almost identical with the advertisements, 75 ; Were recognized as a due ordering by the

Queen, 76 ; Futile attempts to evade their force, 76 ; Testimony of three Convocations, cited by Sir E. Beckett, to their authority, 79 ; Their Reception by the Church, conclusive, 79.

Aidan, Bede's testimony to, 4.

Alexander Halensis as to absolution, 194.

Alms and oblations, 115.

Altar, retained in the book of 1549, 26 ; Removed in 1552, 27, 113.

Ambrose, liturgy of, 105.

American Bishops, synodical declaration of, as to baptism, 178.

Andrew's Day, 57.

Anglican principles as to fasting, 51.

Annunciation, feast of, 55.

Anthems, 93.

Apostles' Creed, 88.

Arian Controversy, 91.

Ascension Day, 52.

Ash-Wednesday, 59.

Assimilation of the Service to the Mass forbidden, 111.

Athanasian Creed, 52.

Augustine, the Monk, Mission to the Saxons, 1 ; Of Hippo, appealed to the Emperor to heal the division of the Church, 7.

Authorship of the Communion Service, 109.

Banns of marriage, 115.

Barnabas's Day, 55.

Baronius as to the title of universal Bishop, 14.

Bartholomew's, St., day, 56.

Baxter's Prayer Book, and the placing of the elements on the table, 66.

Beckett, Sir E., as to the Advertisements, 79.

Bede's testimony on the independence of the Ancient British Church, 2, 5.

Bellarmino as to spurious Saints, 51.

Black rubric, the, 32, 36, 133.
 Bonaventure's Psalter, 15.
 Bread, wafer, forbidden, 130.
 Britain, Romish Mission to, 1.
 Breviary, the, 22.
 British Church sent deputies to ancient Councils, 1 ; Refused to receive Augustine as its Archbishop, 2 ; Maintained its independence to a late date, 5.
 Buchanan's researches in India, 53.
 Bucer's influence in the revision of the Prayer Book, 28.
 Bullinger, Decades of, 206, 214.
 Burnet, Bishop, as to the creed, 89.
 Calendar, The, 40.
 Celebrant, The Position of the, 119.
 Canon, The, of the Mass, 121.
 Carter's admission as to the word Priest, 216.
 Catholic, The word, 90.
 Chalcedon, Council of, as to the equality of the Bishops of Rome and Constantinople, 13.
 Chasubles, The, worn according to mediæval usage by the Celebrant at the Altar, 69 ; A sacrificial robe distinct from the cope, 69 ; Allowed by the book of 1549, 70 ; Cope allowed by the book of 1549 instead of, 70 ; Forbidden by the book of 1552, 71 ; Legally set aside by the advertisements, 72 ; As a sacrificial vestment, not sanctioned by the Church of England, 75 ; The appointment of the surplice, as the vesture of the Celebrant, sets aside the Chasuble, 77 ; This appointment cannot be evaded by wearing the surplice inside the Chasuble, 77.
 Christmas Day, 53.
 Cloth communion, 65.
 Colman refused to unite with Rome, 5.
 Commemorations, what they mean, 39.
 Columba's mission to England, 2.
 Commissioners, Royal (1823), as to the supremacy in the Primitive Church, 7.
 Communion service, 109.
 Concomitance, The doctrine of, 142.
 Cope, The, a processional, not eucharistic vestment, 69 ; Allowed by the book of 1549, 70 ; Forbidden in 1552, 71 ; Allowed in 1565 only in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches on certain occasions, 72.
 Chester, Dean of, as to oblations, 117.
 Councils attended by British Bishops, 1.
 Council of Trent puzzled, 17 ; On the Mass, 143 ; On concomitance, 142 ; Puzzled, 144 ; On *opus operatum*, 177.
 Court of Appeal in the reign of Henry VIII, 10 ; Of Elizabeth, 11 ; Of Victoria, 11 ; The adviser of the Crown, 12 ; Judgment of as to the cross, 63 ; As to lights, 64 ; As to the communion cloth, 65 ; As to the side table, 65 ; As to the advertisements, 74.
 Cranmer and his influence, 25 ; Renounced Lutheran opinions as to the Lord's supper, 26 ; As to vigils, 26 ; As to the Sarum office, 110 ; As to corporal presence, 134.
 Creed, New, of Rome, 19 ; Apostles', 88 ; Athanasian, 90 ; Nicene, 91.
 Cross, The, 63.
 Dead prayer for, rejected, 199.
 Declaration of American Bishop as to baptismal regeneration, 178.
 Declaration, The post communion, 32, 36, 133.
 Decoration of Church, excessive, discountenanced, 67.
 Decretals, The false, 14.
 Delegates, Court of, established in the reign of Henry VIII, 10.
 Dominical letters, 44.
 Donation, The spurious, of Constantine, 14.

Doyle, Bishop, his Catechism as to fasting, 62.
 Durel's Latin Prayer Book (Marshall), 166, 216.
 East, Turning to the, 92.
 Easter, Controversy regarding, 43.
 Eastward position, Romish, according to L'Estrange, 121.
 Ember days, 59.
 Epacts, The, 44.
 Epiphanius as to paintings in Churches, 67.
 Epiphany, The, 54.
 Erudition, The, of a Christian man, 25.
 Evening prayer, 87.
 Eusebius states that Apostles preached in Britain, 1; States that Anicetus, Bishop of Rome, and Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, agreed to differ as to Easter, 40.
 Fasting, Church of England as to, 60; Primitive Christians, as to, 61; Church of Rome, as to, 61.
 Faussett as to the Litany, 104.
 Festivals and Fasts, 48.
 Florence of Worcester, his chronicle, 4, 9, 16.
 Forged epistles to promote Papal supremacy, 14.
 Freeman's Principles of Divine Service, introduction.
 Friday, Good, 59.
 Gardiner, Bishop, and the Prayer Book of 1549, 29.
 Gedge as to the Sarum Communion Office, 111.
 Gelasius compiled a liturgy, 105.
 Gloria in excelsis, The, 130.
 Golden number, The, 43.
 Good Friday, 59.
 Goulburn, Dean, as to the oblation of ourselves, 130; As to non-Communicant attendance, 145.
 Gown, The, in the pulpit, used from time immemorial, 80; Gregory, Bishop of Rome, protested against the title of Universal Bishop, 14; Compiled a liturgy, 105.
 Grindal as to the perambulation of parishes, 105.
 Hampton Court Conferences, 33.
 Harding, his objection as to the Psalms, 85; On the Lord's Supper, 135.
 Hebrews xiii. 10, Cranmer and Ridley as to, 27.
 Hell, meaning of the word, 89.
 Hermann of Cologne, his litany, 102; Baptismal Service, 158, 160, 161, 177.
 Hii, *see* Iona.
 Homilies, The, 25; As to fasting, 60; As to vestments, 68; As to the Keys, 192; As to Auricular Confession, 197; As to prayer for the dead, 204; Warning of, as to sacrifice, 217.
 Hooker defended the Royal Supremacy, 12.
 Hooper, Bishop, as to the ignorance of the clergy, 18; On the Lord's Supper, 135.
 Horæ, The, 23.
 Hours, The Canonical, 22.
 Howson, Dean, as to oblations, 117.
 Images, worship of, 16; Rejected by the Reformers, 67.
 Indulgences, 17.
 Injunctions of 1547, 25; Of 1559, 32.
 Innocents' Day, 54.
 Invocation of Saints, 24.
 Iona, mission establishment of, 3; Maintained its independence of Rome till A.D. 716, 5.
 Ireland, Church of, canon of, as to vestments, 81.
 Irish mission to England, 2.
 Jacobson, Bishop, as to the Catechism, 165.
 James's, St., Day, 56.
 Jebb as to the Litany, 101.
 Jewel's reply to Harding as to the Psalms, 85; As to Comitance, 142.
 John the Baptist's Day, 55.
 John the Evangelist's Day, 54.
 Justin Martyr on the public reading of Scripture, 45.
 King, Lord Chancellor, as to the meaning of the word "Hell," 89.

King James and the Hampton Court Conference, 33.

Kneeling, the declaration on, 133.

Knox, John, in reference to the Black Rubric, 133 ; as to the Thirty-nine Articles, 175.

Latimer's opinion of the Mass, 112.

Latin Prayer Book, The, of 1660, 49.

Legends, Mediæval, 39.

Lent, 59.

Leofric's Liturgy, 106.

Lessons, The, 44 ; The Prayer Book Tables Act, 46.

Lights on the table forbidden, 64.

Litany, The Mediæval, 24 ; translated, 25.

Lord's Supper, the title, 112 ; Its nature, 139.

Luke, St., The Evangelist's Day, 56.

Lumby, Professor, as to the Athanasian Creed, 91.

Malabar, Church, and St. Thomas, in, 53.

Man, Christian, "The Institution of a," 24.

Mamertus, and rogations, 105.

Manual Mediæval, The, 23.

Mark's, St., Day, 55.

Marriage Service, The, 179.

Marriott's "Vestiarium Christianum," 68.

Marshall, Dr., edition of the Latin Prayer Book, 166, 216.

Martyr, Peter, and the Revision of 1552, 28 ; author of the 2nd exhortation (Com.), 118 ; expressed his approval of the Baptismal Service, 159 ; as to the baptismal controversy, 175.

Mass, The, difficulties of the Council of Trent as to, 17 ; Ridley's injunction not to imitate, 28 ; doctrine of, 143.

Matthew's, St., Day, 56.

Matthias' Day, 55.

Michael and All Angels, 56.

Millenary petition, 32.

Missals, mediæval, 21.

Montanist, Tertullian became a, 61.

Monition, important, regarding Black letter days, 49.

Morning and Evening Prayer, 82.

Mosley, Dr., on the salvation of infants, 163 ; on the term regeneration, 169 ; as to the hypothetical interpretation, 177.

Nice, Council of, and its Easter regulations, 42.

Nicholls as to the Litany, 103 ; as to the word priest, 216.

Nicene Creed, 90.

Nocturns, 22.

Norman Kings, supremacy of, 10.

Non-communicant attendance, 144.

Notices, or Prefaces to the Prayer Book, 37.

Oblations, The bread and wine not the, 115.

Offering of Christ, finished, 143.

Order, other, taken in 1565-6, 72.

Ornaments' rubric, 63 ; ornaments of the Church, 63 ; of the minister, 68.

Oswy, the King, after the discussion at Whitby, joined the Roman communion, 9.

Overton, Bishop, as to the bread in communion, 131.

Palmer as to the Litany, 120 ; as to Leofric's liturgy, 106.

Papal corruptions, 13.

Passover, The feast of, 140.

Paradise, reference to, 89.

Parker, Archbishop, to Cecil as to the advertisements, 73.

Paul, conversion of St., 54.

Peter's, St., Day, 55.

Philip and James's Day, 55.

Pilkington, Bishop, as to the Breviary, 22 ; as to the Sarum office of the Mass, 112.

Pope, Mr., as to non-communicant attendance, 145.

Pisa, Council of, complained of the ignorance and vices of the clergy, 18.

Pontifical, The, 23.

Pope Pius's creed, 19.

Preces Privatæ, The, 49.

Presentation of Christ in the Temple, 54.

Priest, no sacrificing, 216.
 Psalms, The, 85.
 Purgatory, 17.
 Puritans, The, at the Hampton Court Conference, 33; at the Savoy, 34; thankful for the block rubric declaration, 36.
 Quadragesima Sunday, 52.
 Quinquagesima Sunday, 52.
 Radbert, Paschasius, as to corporal presence, 16.
 Reception by the Church, the highest authority, 79.
 Reformation, need of acknowledged by the Council of Trent, 19.
 Reformed Prayer Book of 1549, 28.
 Responds, what they mean, 39.
 Riddle as to Christmas, 53.
 Ridley's injunctions to take down altars, 27; his opinion of the Mass, 111.
 Ridsdale judgment, 37.
 Rock, Dr., as to the mediæval vestments, 69.
 Rogation days, 59.
 Revision, The, of 1549, 24; of 1552, 27; of 1559, 30; of 1604, 33; of 1662, 34.
 Sabbath, The, 53.
 Sadler, 189, 216.
 Saints All, Day, 57.
 Saints' days are those only of scriptural and undoubted saints, 51.
 Sarum offices, The, 69, 106, 110, 111.
 Saxon Kings, their supremacy, 8.
 Scripture, ignorance of, in the Middle Ages, 18; translation of, 24.
 Scotland, Church of, 161, 176, 196, 215.
 Sealed Books, the, 37, 114, 115.
 Secker, Archbishop, as to psalms in public worship, 85.
 Septuagesima Sunday, 52.
 Services shortened Act, 95.
 Sexagesima Sunday, 52.
 Simon and Jude's Day, 57.
 Sparke, Dr., his work, 34.
 Stephens, Dr., as to the word "retained" in the Ornaments' Rubric, 78; As to the *Amen* after the Lord's Prayer, 83, 114; As to repelling from Communion, 133; As to banns of marriage, 115.
 Sunday or Sabbath, 53.
 Supper, The Lord's the title, 112.
 Supremacy Royal, exercised in the Primitive Church, 6; And in the Greek Church, 7; And in the Anglo-Saxon Church, 8; and in the Norman Church, 10; and at the Reformation, 10; Received by the Church, 12; acknowledged by the clergy in ordination, 13; Oath of, 210.
 Synodals, what they mean, 39.
 Synodical declaration of American Bishops as to regeneration and baptism, 178.
 Table Communion, The, substituted for Altar, 27, 113.
 Te Deum, The, 86.
 Tertullian as to the British Church, 1; As to the Creed, 88; became a Montanist, and denounced the Catholic Christians as psychics, or carnal, because they did not *command* fasting, 61.
 Thomas's Day, 53.
 Theodoret as to the British Church, 1.
 Transubstantiation, 16.
 Trent, Council of, in a difficulty, 17; As to concomitance, 142; As to the Mass, 143.
 Trinity Sunday, 52.
 Uni (Wina) Bishop, 9.
 Uniformity, Acts of (1559-1662) attached to the Prayer Book, 37.
 Usage of the Church as to vestments, 79.
 Vasco de Gama and the Christians in Malabar, 53.
 Vestments of the Clergy regulated in 1559, not by rubric, but by Act of Parliament, 31; Primitive usage as to, 68; Mediæval usage, 69; Usage of 1549, 70; Usage of 1552, 71; Usage of 1559, 71.

Visitation of the sick, 181.
Victor Bishop of Rome, Intolerance of, disregarded, 41.
Wafer Bread, 130.
Wheatly as to the black letter days, 50; As to All Saints' Day, 57; As to Confession, 182.
Whit Sunday, 52.
Whitby, Discussion at, on communion with Rome, 5.
Whitgift as to prayer for the dead, 206; As to orders, 214.
Whytehead as to the versicles, 84; As to the Te Deum, 86;
As to the Magnificat, 87.
Wilfrid, the Romish advocate, 5.
Wina (Uini) Bishop, 9.
Wiseman, Cardinal, his Catechism as to fasting, 62.
Worship of the Virgin Mary, 15.
Wordsworth, Bishop of St. Andrew's, as to the Eastward position, 120.
Year, Act of Parliament regulating the commencement of the year, 42.

BX 5141 B53 1800z TRIN

Blakeney, R. P.

Hand-book of the liturgy of
the Church of England 134393

DATE

ISSUED TO

BX 5141 B53 1800z TRIN

Blakeney, R. P.

Hand-book of the liturgy of
the Church of England 134393

